Doctoral Education in Context

Perspectives from Africa

Edited by
Jan Botha, Liezel Frick, Nompilo Tshuma

AFRICAN
MINDS

Published in 2024 by African Minds
4 Eccleston Place, Somerset West, 7130
Cape Town, South Africa
info@africanminds.org.za
www.africanminds.org.za

All contents of this document, unless specified otherwise, are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.



ISBNs:
978-1-0672535-3-0 Print
978-1-0672535-4-7 e-book
978-1-0672535-5-4 e-pub

Copies of this book are available for free download at www.africanminds.org.za

ORDERS
For orders from Africa:
African Minds
Email: info@africanminds.org.za

For orders from outside Africa:
African Books Collective
PO Box 721, Oxford OX1 9EN, UK
Email: orders@africanbookscollective.com

CHAPTER 16

How are supervision skills developed? Perceptions of doctoral supervisors in selected universities in Kenya

Selline Atieno Oketch

The **Republic of Kenya** is on the eastern coast of Africa. With a population of about 50 million, it is the 27th most populous country in the world, and 7th in Africa. There are 61 fully chartered universities in Kenya. Of these, 36 are public and 25 private institutions. There are also five public and three private university constituent colleges in the country and eight degree-awarding institutions operating with letters of interim authority.

The **Catholic University of Eastern Africa** (CUEA) is in Lang'ata, on the outskirts of Nairobi. The CUEA received its charter in 1992 and currently it is one of the private universities in Kenya with students from across the Eastern African region. CUEA has 5 faculties, 2 schools, 2 institutes, and 1 centre, offering 11 doctoral programmes.

1. Introduction

The study reported in this chapter explored the state of doctoral supervision in Kenyan universities with an emphasis on the development of doctoral supervision skills. The discussion was based on doctoral supervisors' experiences with developing supervision skills in selected universities in Kenya. Supervision forms a critical component of the doctoral process. Supervision is fundamental because throughout the PhD journey, students encounter many challenges (Ndayambaje, 2018) and the supervisor, being a key person in the student's life throughout this period (Ali et al., 2016), is expected to offer the

necessary support and guidance. To this extent, doctoral supervision entails guiding students in aspects such as identifying and critically interpreting relevant literature, developing research protocol and gaining skills in appropriate methods of conducting original research, managing and analysing the data as well as writing up their research (Manderson et al., 2017; Mouton et al., 2015). Doctoral supervisors should therefore be role models who pass on relevant skills to their students (Lugulu, 2022; Manderson et al., 2017).

Doctoral supervision comprises a tripartite relationship between the supervisor, the student and the institution. The doctoral supervisor supports the production of a quality thesis that will meet the expectations of the examination process and the entry of the doctoral student into the broader scholarly community (Amundsen & McAlpine, 2009). Doctoral students come from diverse backgrounds and have varied needs during their studies. The doctoral student expects an effective supervisor to be friendly, approachable, and aware of the standard of work expected from a student (Ali et al., 2006). Such a supervisor mentors a student to develop into an independent researcher (Manathunga, 2006). Problems related to supervision are the leading cause of untimely completion of PhD studies (Ndayambaje, 2018). Limiting itself to the supervisor's role, this study investigated how doctoral supervisors develop skills that ensure efficiency and quality in supervision. It was imperative to explore supervisors' perspectives on their own development of supervision skills.

2. Literature review

Doctoral education is increasingly becoming a critical area of research worldwide, with various institutions establishing frameworks and guidelines to ensure efficiency and quality in the various facets of doctoral education. Recognising and resolving the hurdles candidates face is critical and requires the attention of supervisors (Trafford & Lesham, 2009). Globally, questions are being asked about the quality of postgraduate studies and the supervision process (Spiller et al., 2013). There is increased emphasis on formal training, monitoring and accountability of doctoral supervisors, maintaining high standards as well as achieving higher and timely completion rates (Spiller et al., 2013; Halse, 2011). To enhance the quality of doctoral training, some universities have moved towards making supervisor training compulsory (Manderson et al., 2017). For example, several institutions in Europe have set up mandatory educational development programmes for research supervisors (Manthangu, 2006). A case in point is the Bologna seminar in Salzburg that brought together member universities of the European University Association (EUA) and other

associations of higher education and research to deliberate on reforms in doctoral education leading to a consensus on ten basic principles (Botha et al., 2020; Manderson et al., 2017). Of these principles, the fifth one underscored the crucial role of supervision and assessment and emphasised the need for a contractual framework of shared responsibilities between doctoral candidates, supervisors and the institution (Botha et al., 2020; EUA, 2005, 2010). Research conducted in a UK university on supervisors' experiences of supervising PhD students identified five approaches which were then used to develop a framework for concepts of research supervision in tandem with the changes in the doctoral pedagogy (Lee, 2008).

Mouton et al., (2015) carried out a survey of doctoral supervisors in South Africa the focus of which was PhD supervisory approaches and styles as well as monitoring and feedback in the supervisor–student relationship. The study highlights Garfield's (2005) four-quadrant model of supervisory styles namely, laissez-faire, pastoral, directorial and contractual that a supervisor can adapt and vary at different stages of the student's doctoral research process; with the contractual style being the most preferred by supervisors. The study found that doctoral supervisors at South African universities faced many challenges such as the burden of large numbers of doctoral students to supervise, supervising outside one's area of expertise, poor quality and unpreparedness of many of the doctoral students, and the huge pressure to complete the doctoral study process due to competition for doctoral students. The concern for quality doctoral education in Africa resulted in the development of a comprehensive regional quality assurance framework by the Inter- University Council for East Africa (IUCEA) and the establishment of the Higher Education Qualifications Sub-Framework (HEQSF). Doctoral supervision is among the areas addressed in these frameworks (Botha et al., 2020).

The literature shows that earlier approaches to the development of supervisors focused on the individual supervisory relationships of a student learning from an expert supervisor with mutual roles and responsibilities of supervisors and students (Manathunga, 2006; Spiller et al., 2013). This model was supported by doctoral supervision development programmes such as the one-off workshop formula that sought to impart to the supervisors technical supervisory skills in the areas of roles and responsibilities of supervisors and students, project management, interpersonal relationships and communication (Manathunga, 2006). Largely, supervisors learned about supervision through their experiences of being supervised and received minimal educational development (Manathunga, 2006).

In more recent years, the literature demonstrates an emphasis on more innovative supervisor education programmes such as engaging small groups of supervisors in reflective practices about supervision (Spiller et al., 2013; Manathunga 2006; Amundsen & McAlpine, 2009). One example of such a programme is the Postgraduate Supervisors' Conversations set up in 2009 at the University of Waikato, New Zealand (Spiller et al., 2013), This programme utilises a conversational model whereby supervisors form a community to regularly exchange and explore narratives drawn from their own supervision experiences. The other examples are the Learning Circle on Postgraduate Supervision series and Compassionate Rigour: Effective Supervision programme established in 2002 (Manathunga, 2006). The former adopts methods that provide a context for supervisors to reflect on their own practice and share thoughts on their supervision strategies through informal presentations and reflection on postgraduate supervision experiences through activities such as role-plays, videos, dramatic performances and case studies. In the latter programme, supervisors are trained to strike a balance between having compassion for students and providing rigorous feedback on student performance.

In the African context, the literature shows that poor quality supervision is one of the innumerable challenges doctoral programmes faces (Ndayambaje 2018; Lugulu, 2022; Mohamedbhai, 2020; Rong'uno et al., 2016). Mbogo et al. (2020) cited the challenge of supervision as the main reason for delays in the completion of PhD studies in Kenyan universities, calling it an ethical matter that requires redress. The literature reviewed in their study reveals other factors associated with supervision such as a shortage of qualified supervisors, where some supervisors have insufficient knowledge of the students' research topics and hence are unable to provide constructive guidance. This latter view was confirmed by participant students in the findings of the same study while supervisors cited heavy workloads and non-enforcement of supervisory regulations as some of the supervision challenges they experienced. It is, therefore, imperative for supervisors to take cognisance of the triangular nature of the supervision process consisting of the student, the supervisor and their relationship where each has a significant role to play. This relationship needs to create a 'fit' which leads to the student's satisfaction with their supervision (Pyhältö et al., 2015).

This issue of 'fit' is pertinent because it is what can make or break a doctoral; and researchers elaborate on it in different ways (Lee, 2008; Keefer, 2015; Bastalich, 2017). Timely completion of doctoral studies can be enhanced if monitoring and structured systems such as deadlines and standard supervision guidelines are established (Rong'uno et al., 2016). This is akin to drawing up a

memorandum of understanding (MoU) between the supervisor and the student that specifies meeting schedules as well as each party's responsibilities.

In Kenya, the Ministry of Education and the Commission for University Education (CUE) require universities to examine and improve higher degree training and supervision (Manderson et al., 2017). In 2019, there was a public outcry in Kenya when a public university awarded PhD degrees to an unusually high number of students. The CUE's report on the investigation highlighted, among other findings, inadequate supervision and heavy workload for some supervisors' way beyond the threshold of three PhDs and five master's in an academic year as provided under CUE's Universities' Standards and Guidelines (Ligami, 2019; Ndiege, 2019, Mohamedbhai, 2020). Training programmes for PhD supervisors have been cited as one of the steps towards solution of these challenges. This study joins these calls and extends the scholarly conversation on the significance of improving the quality of doctoral supervision by focusing attention on how supervisors develop their supervision skills.

3. Objectives

3.1 General

- To explore how doctoral supervisors develop supervision skills.

3.2 Specific

- To determine supervisors' opinions on whether they develop supervision skills within the guidelines for doctoral supervision in Kenyan universities.
- To assess the perceptions of doctoral supervisors on the specific indicators of how they developed supervision skills.
- To describe the challenges that new doctoral supervisors experience in the process of learning how to supervise.
- To recommend any practices that could enhance the supervisors' skills and improve doctoral supervision in Kenyan universities.

4. Methodology

The study was conducted in Kenya between October and November 2020. The study utilised qualitative research methodology where expert purposive sampling was used to identify eight doctoral supervisors drawn from five disciplines across six different universities in Kenya, five public and one private. The

sample consisted of two supervisors with over ten years of doctoral supervision experience, four with over five years of doctoral supervision and two in their initial year of doctoral supervision. Discipline-wise, two supervisors specialized in literature, two in linguistics, two in education, one in business and one in women studies. In addition, one interviewee was at the level of professor; six were senior lecturers and only one was at the level of lecturer. Telephone calls and WhatsApp, and social media platforms were used to contact participants and explain to them the nature of the study. The respondents were sampled because they are doctoral supervisors and would provide information based on their knowledge and experience. An online questionnaire and phone interviews were used as the most appropriate data collection methods because they allowed the participants the flexibility of elaborating on their opinions on how they developed doctoral supervision skills, as the study sought from them. The link for the questionnaire was sent to the participants through emails. Data were downloaded and summarised according to the participants' responses to each item on the questionnaire. A qualitative descriptive methodology was used to describe and interpret the data collected. The participants were asked fifteen questions, and their responses were analysed and grouped into themes that formed the four main categories reflected by the objectives of this study.

5. Results and discussion

5.1 Views about guidelines for doctoral supervision in Kenyan universities

The Commission for University Education (CUE) (2014) stipulates that an academic staff member must be assigned to supervise a thesis considering their teaching load, administration duties, and supervision experience. Further, an academic staff member may supervise a maximum of five master's and three doctoral students in any given academic year. The regulatory body also requires each university to provide clear guidelines on various operations, including the conduct of studies and supervision (CHE, 2008).

The respondents were asked questions concerning eligibility for doctoral supervision, the number of years between PhD attainment and the assignment of first supervision as well as the maximum number of doctoral students that they supervise per year. On eligibility for supervision, all eight respondents cited the attainment of a doctorate and expertise in the student's area of research as key eligibility criteria for doctoral supervision. One respondent expressed reservations on the interpretation of 'expertise':

> *Expertise is sometimes taken to be so broad which is still likely to pose a challenge to a supervisor because within a discipline like Literature, for example, different specializations require specific expertise. A lecturer in say Genre Analysis and interpretation may not have the expertise to supervise in the area of performing arts or film studies. The same applies to linguistics and many other disciplines.* (Senior lecturer, literature)

Concerning the number of doctoral students per supervisor, all respondents, except one, had a maximum of three doctoral supervisees in line with the Commission for University Education's regulation that each supervisor should not supervise more than three doctoral students per year. The one respondent shared that he had four doctoral students due to a shortage of supervisors. Studies show that additional numbers of students to supervise is increasingly becoming one of the challenges of doctoral supervision (Mouton et al., 2015).

On the period between the doctorate and first supervision, the responses show that the participants' institutions follow the guidelines set by their departments, that one was eligible for supervision three years after the doctorate. Only one began to supervise soon after attaining a PhD due to lack of doctoral supervisors in his field to match the number of students enrolled. A similar situation was reflected in a survey of doctoral supervisors in South Africa, with the researchers strongly recommending that novice supervisors do not initially accept more than one or two students to supervise or, preferably, to do so under an experienced supervisor (Mouton et al., 2015).

5.2 How the supervisors developed supervision skills, the core areas of the students' research that they examined and the students' main challenges in research

The main purpose of this survey was to determine from the participants how they developed their supervision skills. All the respondents expressed that they learned from their own experiences as postgraduate students and transferred their own supervisors' best practices first to supervision at the master's level which they then refined for the doctoral level. Additionally, one respondent stated that he learned supervision skills from a doctoral supervision course offered to supervisors across Africa, while two others highlighted self-learning on the job and reading manuals on requirements for supervision as well as consultations. This response corroborates the finding that supervisors learn self-protective strategies while supervising their students (Halse, 2011). In contrast, the study by Halse also found that supervisors learn disciplined

supervision that entailed discarding their supervisors' mode of supervision during their own doctorate and shaping new identities. One respondent expressed the following opinion:

> *Ideally, you should learn through mentorship but in our institutions, mentors at the level of professors and associate professors are sometimes shuttled off into administration so they lose academic grounding with the field and leave supervision to young researchers. We need to understand our context and challenges and regularize scholarly communities.* (Senior lecturer, applied linguistics)

As an indicator of their doctoral supervision skills, the respondents were further asked to specify the core areas of the students' research that they examine. The recurrent areas in their responses include the research problem, literature review, methodology, application of theory and the ability to write the thesis. These areas would all fit in the category of the functional approach to supervision. Lee (2008) developed a framework for research supervision concepts that also includes enculturation, critical thinking, emancipation and relationship development. Lee notes that whereas pragmatic issues such as time and workload may create the option of a functional approach, the last two approaches help students to work towards independence.

The participants were also asked to mention the areas that doctoral students find most challenging during the research. They cited clear identification and explanation of research gaps, conceptualising the research problem, as well as identifying and applying a relevant theory. Other areas included the analysis and reporting of different categories of data, sampling and reluctance to read widely. Some of these challenges are like those identified in a study in Kenyan universities by Mbogo et al. (2020), which showed that students lacked sufficient writing skills, research skills and the competence to adequately read the literature on the research topic. Other literature relate doctoral students' challenges to the diverse nature of the postgraduate student population in terms of culture, gender, language and background experience (Mouton et al., 2015; Spiller et al., 2013; Halse, 2011; Amundsen & McAlpine, 2009).

Related questions within this objective asked how often the supervisor met the supervisee and their responsibilities in relation to those of the co-supervisor. From the responses, four met the students as often as possible and when the need arose, three met them once a month while one met them once a week. The respondents were further asked to specify their responsibilities in relation to those of the co-supervisors. From their responses, it was construed that all

except two are first supervisors. Two respondents expressed that both supervisors are collectively and independently responsible for guiding the student and they exchange feedback. One stated that the first supervisor should mentor the co-supervisor, but this is not always the case. One other response was as follows:

> *We expect teamwork although you find other members doing so little in terms of giving feedback to students. It becomes lopsided since there is no clear indication of who does what apart from that the first supervisor does a lot of correspondence between the student and the Graduate school.* (Senior lecturer, women studies)

Another respondent had this to say:

> *Our policies are not well-structured, especially on the role of the co-supervisor. From my own experience as a doctoral student in the West, my second supervisor provided a methodological angle to my study and acted as the critical eye.* (Senior lecturer, linguistics)

Generally, what emerges from these responses is that although universities may have regulations governing doctoral supervision, it is important for supervisors to adopt best practices from other contexts such as drawing up a memorandum of understanding (MoU) between the supervisor and the student that spells out expectations and timelines so that even students begin to take charge of their own responsibilities. A written agreement of this kind enhances the working relationship and can highly minimize the challenges of supervision. Other practices include adopting a combination of "compassion" and "rigour" (Manthangu, 2006:17) in the supervision process and learning to be flexible to address students' needs at different stages of the doctorate (Halse, 2011).

5.3 The challenges that the supervisors experienced in the course of their first doctoral supervision

As indicated above, three years after attaining the doctorate, one is eligible for doctoral supervision. It is a transitional state from the supervised to being the supervisor. This study considered how universities facilitate that transition and sought to find out from the participants their own experiences of how they became supervisors. The respondents felt that they should have been formally inducted into supervision through some departmental or faculty training programmes. Seven respondents indicated that three years after attaining the

PhD, they were assigned students to supervise without any formal structure to train them as new doctoral supervisors, so they received no training on doctoral supervision. They relied on how they were supervised as doctoral students. One respondent indicated that she trained in her post-doctoral programme before she began to supervise.

It was evident that the respondents were conscious that doctoral study in itself does not train one to become a supervisor and there is a need for specialized training that focuses on doctoral supervision. One respondent indicated that he attends regular workshops and seminars organised by his departments on a wide range of academic areas. One other respondent had attended a course for training postgraduate supervisors before he began to supervise. One respondent pointed out the feeling of inexperience and fear associated with supervising outside his subject area even if slightly related. Another found herself arranging several meetings with students to discuss minor issues that students could work out independently.

A seminar organised by CUE and other partners in 2016 recognised the training of supervisors as a priority area (Botha et al., 2020). While workshops may be the initial starting points to train doctoral supervisors, the available literature indicates that the one-off workshop formula may not be adequate and there is a need to adopt more innovative practices such as bringing the doctoral supervisors together to reflect and have conversations on their own experiences (Manthangu, 2006; Spiller et al., 2013).

5.4 Suggestions on areas of improvement to ensure that the supervisors' skills yield quality doctoral supervision

All the respondents suggested that their departments should put in place training programmes to induct doctoral supervisors. They also expressed that exposure to more research opportunities for growth and diversification would greatly enhance their supervision skills. Other suggestions for improvement that the respondents made were regular submission of supervision reports, equitable distribution of supervision tasks and the need to put in place mechanisms to ensure that students admitted into the doctoral programme have the capacity to undertake research, and collaborations with other institutions as a way of addressing the problem of supervisory capacity as well as sharing the best supervision practices.

These suggestions show that doctoral supervision is a broad area that requires diverse research. They are also consistent with findings in previous literature that there is a need to invest in supervisor educational development

for doctoral supervisors to reflect on their pedagogical understandings of their own supervision strategies (Manathunga, 2006; Spiller et al., 2013; Halse, 2011; Amundsen & McAlpine, 2009).

The data generated in this study, despite emanating from a small sample, is critical to understanding the current state of doctoral supervision and doctoral study completion rates in both private and public Kenyan universities. It corroborates findings in other studies (Rong'uno et al., 2016; Mbogo et al., 2022; Lugulu, 2022).

6. Limitations of the study

The study sample of eight doctoral supervisors was very small given that the eight were drawn from six universities in Kenya. The limited time for this study necessitated the researcher's use of expert purposive sampling methodology to identify doctoral supervisors who were already known and accessible through WhatsApp, email and telephone to provide the data. Furthermore, the study did not include doctoral students to assess their own perceptions of the quality of the supervision they received from supervisors hence the study only relied on the perceptions of the supervisors to assess how doctoral supervisors developed supervision skills.

7. Recommendations

Based on the findings, the study recommends that Kenyan universities enhance induction training for new supervisors in the form of workshops, seminars and conferences, both at the faculty and institutional levels. In addition, new supervisors should begin supervision as co-supervisors where the first supervisor should be an expert in the supervision field and thus provide mentorship. The universities should introduce the contract method where supervisors and students draw up a memorandum of understanding (MoU) to regulate their meetings, areas of the research to focus on, each party's responsibilities and clear timelines for the completion of the project. Doctoral supervisors should also be exposed to regular training with a focus on exposing them to diverse supervision styles and models. Specifically, the supervisors should be exposed to models such as Garfield's (2005) model elaborately discussed in (Mouton et al., 2015). The model identifies two dimensions of supervision namely, structure and support, and spells out the relevant supervision styles that supervisors can adopt in the various stages of supervision. There is a need to benchmark with more established universities to keep abreast with the current global doctoral

supervision practices that may be transferable to their contexts. The study has already referred to the reflective practices of supervision (Manathunga, 2006) and the conversational approach of the case study at Waikato University, New Zealand (Spiller et al., 2013). Doctoral supervisors in Kenyan universities could initiate their own conversations to share and exchange ideas and thoughts about their supervision skills and strategies. Finally, there is a need to investigate the findings of this study further with a larger sample drawn from one university and later extend it to a few universities in Kenya.

8. Conclusion

The study sought to assess how doctoral supervisors developed their supervision skills. The data examined were based on the perceptions of eight supervisors drawn from six universities in Kenya. Questions on supervision guidelines and challenges encountered during supervision as well as the capacity-building measures taken by departments or faculties in the respective universities aimed at demonstrating the significance of supervisory skills to the whole doctoral study process. The study identified a few indicators to show that supervisors continue to develop supervision skills. However, it also identified challenges that supervisors experienced as new doctoral supervisors and those that persist as well as some strategies for improving the quality of doctoral supervision. These conclusions can be summarised as follows:

Doctoral supervisors in universities in Kenya generally follow standards and regulations on supervision set up by the Commission for University Education.

Mentorship in doctoral supervision is weak such that new doctoral supervisors who mostly begin to supervise three years after their doctorate receive minimal induction into supervision as many departments have not established such training programmes.

The initial skills that they bring into the supervision process are those that they gained from observing from their supervisors during their own doctoral studies.

However, doctoral supervisors are keen to develop their supervision skills, and they use every opportunity that avails itself in the process of supervision.

They systematically develop skills through experience, self-learning, reading manuals, consultations and attending workshops and seminars on doctoral supervision

References

Ali, P. A., Watson, R., & Dhingra, K. (2016). Postgraduate research students and their supervisors' attitudes towards supervision. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 11*, 227–221. https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/2895/

Amundsen, C., & McAlpine, L. (2009). Learning supervision: Trial by fire. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 46*(3), 331–342. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703290903068805

Bastalich, W. (2017). Content and context in knowledge production: A critical review of doctoral supervision literature. *Studies in Higher Education, 42*(7), 1145–1157. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1079702

Bitzer, E. (2016). Research into doctoral education: A survey of institutional research projects in South Africa. In J. Botha & N. Miller (Eds.), *Institutional Research in South Africa Higher Education*. pp. 277-297. Stellenbosch: SUN Press.

Botha, J., Kuria, M., Ozgoren, M., & Wilde, M. (2020). Quality doctoral education in Africa: A question of setting the right standards. In Rule, P., Bitzer, E., & Frick, L. (Eds.) *The Global Scholar: Implications for Postgraduate Studies and Supervision*. pp. 149-174. SUN Media.

Commission for University Education. (2014). *University standards and guidelines.* https://www.jooust.ac.ke/downloads/insefood/CUE_UNIVERSITIES_STANDARDS_AND_GUIDELINES_June_2014.pdf

Commission for Higher Education. (2008). *Handbook on processes for quality assurance in higher education in Kenya.* https://www.cue.or.ke/index.php?option=com_phocadownload&view=category&download=67:handbook-on-processes-for-quality-assurance-in-higher-education-in-kenya&id=12:general&Itemid=392

Dietz, T., Jansen, J., & Wadee, A. (2006). *South Africa–Netherlands research programmes in alternatives in development (SANPAD); Effective PhD supervision and mentorship: A workbook based on experiences from South Africa and the Netherlands.* Pretoria: UNISA Press.

Halse, C. (2011). Becoming a supervisor: The impact of doctoral supervision on supervisors' learning. *Studies in Higher Education, 36*(5), 557–570. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.594593

Keefer, J. (2015). Experiencing doctoral liminality as a conceptual threshold and how supervisors can use it. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 52*(1), 17–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2014.981839

Lee, A. (2008). How are doctoral students supervised? Concepts of doctoral research supervision. *Studies in Higher Education, 33*(3), 267–381.

Ligami, C. (2020). Over 100 PhDs face review in single university. *University World News.* https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20190802072552 86

Lugulu, J. (2022). Students' perception of factors that influence completion rates of doctoral studies in public universities in Kenya. *International Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Science.* https://doi.org/10/1054922/IJEHSS.2022.0366

Manderson, L., Bondjers, G., Izugbara, C., Cole, D. C., Egesa, O., Ezeh, A., & Fonn, S. (2017). Enhancing doctoral supervision practices in Africa. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa, 15*(2), 23–40. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26640369

Manathunga, C. (2006). The development of research supervision: "Turning the light on a private space." *International Journal for Academic Development, 10*(1), 17–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/13601440500099977

Mbogo, R. W., Ndiao, E., Wambua, J. M., Ireri, N. W., & Ngala, F. W. (2020). Supervision challenges and delays in completion of PhD programmes in public and private universities: Experiences of supervisors and graduate students in Kenya. *European Journal of Education, 6*(11), 261–278. https://www.oapub.org/edu

Mouton, J., Boshoff, N., & James, M. (2015). A survey of doctoral supervision in South Africa. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 29*(2), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.20853/29-2-467

Mohamedbhai, G. (2020). Quality assurance of doctoral education is now urgent. *University World News Africa Edition*. https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20200609091837168

Ndayambaje, I. (2018). Effects of supervision on timely completion of PhD programme. *Rwandan Journal, 4*(2), 57–70. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/rje/article/view/175133

Ndiege, J. R. (2019). Kenyan varsities need training programmes for PhD supervisors. *Business Daily*. https://www.businessdailyafrica.com/analysis/ideas/Kenyan-universities-should-train-PhD-supervisors/4259414-5125406-11fwuus/index.html

Pyhältö, K., Vekalia, J., & Koeskinen, J. (2015). Fit matters in the supervisory relationship: Doctoral students and supervisors' perceptions about the supervisory activities. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 52*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2014.981836

Rong'uno, S. K., Okoth, U., & Akala, W. (2016). Supervision-related factors influencing doctoral studies completion rates in education at public universities in Kenya. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development, 5*(10), 462–477. https://www.ijird.com

Spiller, D., Byrnes, G., & Ferguson, P. B. (2013). Enhancing postgraduate supervision through a process of conversational inquiry. *Higher Education Research & Development, 32*(5), 833–845. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2013.776519

Trafford, V., & Lesham, S. (2009). Doctorateness as a threshold concept. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 46*(3), 305–316. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703290903069027

Appendix

Link to Google form questionnaire:
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1GEnim_mu7h3SeZo-jHlkYkhVwki3IhHGx-VWLojHuH-g/edit

TOWARDS BECOMING A DOCTORAL SUPERVISOR

I am conducting a survey as part of a course on the Supervision of Doctoral studies in African Universities. Kindly fill out the survey below which is a brief exploration of the training of doctoral supervisors. Your voluntary participation is highly appreciated and no personal details will be shared in the write-up of the data. Thank you in advance for your responses.

Your email address

_____

Question 1- Demographics-Age
☐ 30-40
☐ 41-50
☐ 51-60
☐ 61 and above

Question 2- Qualification
☐ Master's Degree
☐ Doctorate

Question 3- Your discipline of study
Your answer

_____

Question 4- Number of PhD candidates currently under your supervision
☐ 1-3
☐ 4-6
☐ 0
☐ Other

Question 5- The years between your own PhD and your first doctoral supervision
☐ 1-3
☐ 4-6
☐ Other

Question 6-What three reasons motivate you to supervise doctoral students?
Your answer

_____

Question 7- Explain the policy of your institution or faculty governing the eligibility for doctoral supervision and the maximum number of supervisions.
Your answer

_____

Question 8- How did you acquire supervision skills? Did you require any form of training before you began to supervise doctoral students? Briefly explain.
Your answer

_____

Question 9- How often do you meet your supervisees?
☐ Once a week
☐ Once a month
☐ Other, specify

_____

Question 10-Which four core areas of the student's dissertation/thesis do you focus on in your supervision?
Your answer

_____

Question 11- Kindly share your experience on the area that doctoral students find most challenging during their research process.
Your answer

_____

Question 12- Kindly explain your responsibilities in relation to those for your co-supervisor.
Your answer

_____

Question 13- Kindly share the challenges that you may have experienced when you began your doctoral supervision.
Your answer

_____

Question 14- Does your Department have a programme of inducting young scholars into doctoral supervision? If yes, kindly explain.
Your answer

_____

Question 15- Kindly share your suggestions on the areas that your Department needs to improve on to ensure quality doctoral supervision.
Your answer

_____