Institutional Doctorate Supervision Practices Influencing trends in enrolment and Completion Rates in Doctorate Degree Programmes from selected Public Universities in Kenya

Motanya Jared Ochwangi (corresponding author)

Department of Educational Foundations

Kenyatta University– Africa, Nairobi, Kenya

Nyambura Salome and Peter M. Gathara

Department of Educational Foundations

Kenyatta University– Africa, Nairobi, Kenya

Abstract

Completing a doctorate degree on time is a multifaceted progression, influenced by many interplaying variables. This paper sought to establish how institutional doctorate supervision practices influence completion rates of doctorate programmes from selected public universities in Kenyan. The student-supervisor collaboration is a critical ingredient in doctorate programme studies. This is because when something goes wrong with either in course of their interaction, the ramification is experienced in the period studies take. The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of student-supervisor interaction in doctorate degree programme from selected public universities in Kenya. The Involvement Theory and the Social Support theory were to reveal the reasons for low enrolment and completion rates of doctorates in selected Kenyan public universities. The mixed methods research design were utilised in the current study. Information was obtained from four purposively sampled universities using questionnaires, documentary analysis and interview schedules. Qualitative data was coded and then thematically analysed guided by the study objectives while quantitative data was analysed using percentages and graphs. The findings of the study would be useful for the university managements in understanding the student-supervisor relationship

in doctorate programme studies. Furthermore, would also provide information to interested researchers in related topics in graduate studies. The findings of this research will be resourceful to university policy makers, administrators and lecturers to improve on institutional policy framework which could be used to enhance doctorate degree enrolment and completion in Kenyan public universities.

1. Introduction

Completing a doctorate programme as guided by individual universities' policy statements is significant to both the doctorate candidates, the university and above all the economy. However, completion of this programme is dependent on many interacting variables. These process entails a lot of commitment, enthusiasm, and plentiful readily available resources to achieve it. Currently, universities are enrolling more candidates than ever before. , However, completion rates have not been increasing at the same rate. Attaining a doctorate degree represents not only success of the individual but also economic progress a country attains. At a personal level, registering for a doctorate programme and graduating enhances the likelihood of securing a well job. Furthermore, it amplifies the opportunities towards attainment of self-actualization (Rigler et al., 2017). Doctorates contribute to sustainable societal development through pumping critical lifelong skills in the economy (Odhiambo, 2018). Despite the growing demands of the doctorates globally, the challenges of long time to completion or non-completion are on the rise. Kenya being a member of the global community is experiencing low enrolment and completion rates at doctorate levels when compared with other countries such as Canada, United States, and South Africa (Matheka et al., 2020a, 2020b). This scenario has attracted the attention of both local and global scholars who are seeking to understand the causes and enable prescribing corrective measures to it (Devos et al., 2017). Rigler et al. (2017), have emphasized the significance of supportive human relationships which include warm supervisor-student relationship, doctorate programme environment, and the extent collegial support in determining the outcome of doctorate programme. In Kenya, the continued awareness of the importance of doctorate programme studies has stimulated debates on attrition. Universities, faculties and departments are now rushing to put in place stimulus mechanisms ensuring implementation of programmes to increase enrolment and completion. However, efforts to establish doctorate enrolments and completion rates have been challenging, owing to universities' failure to keep proper records on time taken by candidates before they are awarded doctorates degree (Matheka et al., 2020a). Therefore, lack of adequate data hampers efforts to make decisions and institute policies intended at enhancing enrolments and graduation rates in doctorate programmes. Mukhwana et al. (2016) established that there is lack of a national policy on doctorate programme training in Kenya. Universties have tried to domesticate a few policies touching on doctorate programme training. These policies guide on doctorate programme procedures on admissions, financing and research ethics. However, these guidelines are deficient of spurring increased enrollment and completion. Furthermore, doctorate supervision still remain a toll order for the universities.

Despite the slow upward trends in enrolments into doctorate programmes, completion has continued to be low. The year 2016 saw only 396 doctorates graduate from Kenyan public

universities against CUE target of 1000 per year while there were 5,352 candidates that had been enrolled for doctorate programmes. Furthermore, in a cohort of 388 students enrolled for doctorate programmes in faculties of education of Moi University, Kenyatta University and University of Nairobi between 2001 and 2015, only 63 candidates managed to complete their studies within five years of study. Majority (325) spent over ten years with only 252 completing within this period (Ronguno, 2017). This indicates that the situation of doctorate graduation in Kenya is below expectations when compared to countries like South Africa which produces over 1000 doctorates per year. The case is worse given the CUE recommendation and the Ministry of Education (MoE) that Kenya need to be producing 1000 doctorates per year by the year 2018 to meet her local demand of academicians, researchers and experienced human resource to boost the economy. The current study thus, endevoured to establish the institutional practices which have led to persistence of low doctorate degree enrolment and low doctorate degree graduation rates in Kenyan public universities.

Currently, doctorate programme studies are mostly self-financed and candidates make substantial sacrifices with the expectation that they would complete on time. This expectation is demonstrated through their desire to earn the doctorate degree in a timely manner and secure good careers. With this expectancy, doctorate supervisors have a huge assignment of guaranteeing excellence mentorship within timelines (Kosgei, 2021). It is an honor to be a faculty member and further, to supervise doctorate students; nevertheless, this is compounded with inordinate obligations accompanying the great expectations from the doctorate candidates. This demands that those supervising doctorate students need to understand and match their expectations. There ought to be a powerful balance in student-supervisor relationship to achieve all this. In Kenya, this has been complicated by the rapid expansion of university education for the past one year and increased enrolment of students especially at bachelors' and masters' levels. Scholars argue that this has compromised quality and led to poor doctorate completion rates. The declining quality has been attributed to a high student to staff ratio which practically means poor mentorship and supervision of doctorate students (Kosgei, 2021).

1.1 Problem Statement

The problem of this study was to examine institutional doctorate supervision practices influencing trends in enrolment and completion rates in doctorate degree programmes from selected public universities in Kenya. The developed and fast developing nations of the world are graduating doctorates at higher rates than their market absorption. In Kenya, university training has rapidly expanded for the past two decades. This expansion has led to increased demand for individuals with doctorate level qualifications to work as teachers, researchers and to replace the aging professoriate. There has been political pressure, agitation and clamour in the country where each County was supposed to upgrade the existing middle level colleges to universities without due regard for the teaching staff with doctorate qualifications. This has further been compounded by low number of individuals with doctorate degrees graduating on a yearly basis from public universities compared to what the policies articulated by the Ministry of Education through the State Department of University Education of producing at least 1000 doctorates yearly. Kenya is faced with a crisis since the

number of universities have increased while the number of doctorate holders who are supposed to teach, examine, conduct research and undertake administrative duties in the universities remain static or regressing. There are over 400,000 undergraduate students, 40,177 masters programme students and over 6,000 doctorate degree programme students to be serviced by the slightly below 8,000 doctorate holders. Doctorate programmes' supervision has been singled as one of the impediment towards high enrolment and completion rates hence the current study.

2. Methodology

This study employed a mixed methods approach, embedded design in nature to examine institutional doctorate supervision practices influencing trends in enrolment and completion rates in doctorate degree programmes from selected public universities in Kenya. Creswell and Clark (2007) opine that a mixed method approach encompasses gathering, examining, and interpreting qualitative and quantitative data in a single study in investigating the same underlying phenomenon. This approach was ideal since the study sought to establish both statistically recorded facts and thoughts from the respondents who were involved in the study. According to Creswell (2007), each research design selected for a study contains some degree of weaknesses. Thus, by selecting mixed methods approach, prejudice is minimised and reliability of the study enhanced.

This study was conducted in four selected Kenyan public universities. The study targeted all 6000 doctorate degree programme students from all public universities in Kenya. The particular focus was on doctorate students in Education, Arts and Social Sciences and Pure and Applied Sciences disciplines, deans of schools offering disciplines in Education, Arts and Social Sciences and Pure and Applied Sciences, and faculty members teaching these disciplines

The study adopted a multi-stage sampling technique, first step, the universities were identified, followed by the schools and finally the departments. As such, purposive sampling was used to select the specific department to pitch the study. Purposive sampling technique is employed when the researcher knows where to obtain the required data with regard to the objectives of the study

In order to arrive at the eventual study participants, the researcher sampled four public universities from the thirty one (31) public chartered universities in Kenya. The choice of four public universities was guided by the fact that they are the first four oldest universities in terms of establishment in Kenya

Stratified sampling was used to sample schools and faculties into three major categories namely; Education, Arts and Social Sciences, Pure and Applied Sciences. Further, stratified sampling was used to select departments in order of their establishment. This was necessitated by the fact that the researcher was interested in getting specific participants possessing particular characteristics that could meet the objectives of the study.

A simple random sampling was used to select the male and female faculty members and doctorate students who participated in the study. All deans of schools or faculties and

chairpersons of departments were included in the sample. Therefore, including participants with information concerning the area of study was critical for this study (Orodho, 2008).

Table 1. Sample size of doctorate students

Schools	Departments	Public universities								Total
		UoN		KU		MU		EU		Total
		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M&F
Education	1	27	24	25	16	12	9	11	9	141
	2	11	6	13	9	10	7	18	30	119
	3	9	4	6	3	3	2	-	-	27
	4	10	9	4	1	-	-	4	2	45
Pure and Applied Sciences	1	6	2	5	4	4	2	2	0	29
	2	3	2	4	2	4	1	5	4	30
	3	8	6	6	3	4	4	4	2	42
	4	7	6	4	3	3	2	6	5	40
Arts and Social Sciences	1	16	14	13	11	6	4	10	7	87
	2	13	9	9	8	3	2	11	7	69
	3	23	19	16	11	6	5	5	3	93
	4	16	19	11	12	5	7	9	6	96
TOTAL	**12**	**149**	**120**	**116**	**83**	**60**	**45**	**85**	**75**	**826**

Sources**: Universities' enrolment statistics (2017).**

Information from Table 1 above indicate the sample size distribution of the respondents in the four universities. A total of 826 candidates enrolled for various doctorate degree programmes in the sampled universities.

Table 2. Sample size for university administrators

Officers	Public Universities				TOTALS
	UoN	KU	MU	EU	
Deans	3	3	3	3	**12**
CPD/ HoD	12	12	12	12	**48**
Lecturers	89	93	58	49	**289**
TOTALS	**104**	**108**	**73**	**64**	**349**

Source: Universities' Human Resource Departments (2017)

Using the sample size of 30%, the study targeted 105 university deans of schools and members of the academic staff. The study employed the following tools in data collection; questionnaires, interview schedule and documentary analysis.

The data obtained from the study were analysed both qualitatively and quantitatively guided by the study objectives. The questionnaires had both open-ended and closed-ended questions. Data obtained from the open-ended questions and interviews were coded and transcribed then organised and analysed in their thematic areas.

3. Literature Review

Supervision is vital in doctorate programmes' research and training. Numerous challenges occur regarding doctorate programme supervision. For instance, in the procedure of matching doctorate supervisors and their candidates, some faculties assign supervisors with little or no input from the students. This establishes that no criteria used but rather the willingness of the supervisor to work with the student. Consequently, there is a mismatch between the doctorate student's area of research and the expertise of the supervisor. This often happens where the number of students outweighs the supervisors (Kosgei, 2021). Van der Laan et al. (2021) established that there are insufficiencies in doctorate student supervision leading to non-completion of the doctorate programme. This was further linked to insufficient supervisory and lack of institutional support. The role of a supervisor in doctorate programme studies involves guiding the doctorate student into meaningful academic reading, the logical and critical thinking. The supervisor also guides the doctorate student on how to generate knowledge, as well as managing the entire process of writing the thesis (Firoz, Quamrul & Mohammad, 2013). The excellence of the supervisory rapport is important to the realization of doctorate candidates in concluding their study programme within the estimated or stipulated timelines (Galt, 2013).

The most critical process in doctorate studies is obviously on thesis supervision which bring out the relationship between the supervisor and the doctorate student. Delany (2013) singles out features of an excellent supervisor as an individual who is sociable, able to provide

guidance, encouraging, open-minded, one who readily realizes, owns mistakes and corrects them. Further, the supervisor ought to be thoroughly organised and be able to inspire enthusiasm in research. Consequently, outstanding doctorate candidate's supervision practices and good rapport with the supervisor forms the critical ingredients in successful doctorate training (Dimitrova, 2016). This determines the timeliness towards doctorate programme completion. Ezebilo (2012) supports these assertions in a study conducted in Sweden on challenges in Postgraduate Studies. The study revealed that the successful doctorate research is primarily based on the relationship between the supervisors themselves and between the supervisors and the doctorate candidate. The study concluded that poor student's supervision has serious ramifications on both the quality of doctorate work and the supervisees' motivation and practical advancement. Doctorate supervision demands that candidates are accorded with chances that completely involve them in the study process. This will help bolster the doctorate candidate's ability to incorporate other research practices to advance their course of study which will lead to doctorate completion even as they use appropriate research methods to complete their projects.

Taylor et al. (2017) explain that excellent doctorate thesis guidance is essential to minimise the level of doctorate candidates dropping out of the programme which reflects the severe challenge amongst candidates pursuing doctorate programmes. Through the engagement of the academic guides in studies, the proficiency of doctorate programme candidates is greatly improved. This will make them achieve excellence as well as attain effectiveness in studies and gain proficiency in the study area. Dericks et al. (2019) concurs with this by stating that doctorate supervision mentorship is critical. It encourages doctorate candidates' association with specialized bodies for enhanced visibility. Furthermore, this gives them a chance to interact with experts in their field of study which challenges them to publish their research findings as a way of contributing to intellectual discourses. This is supported further by Taylor et al. (2017) who view supervision as a form of counselling aimed at helping doctorate programme candidates display an excellent form of participation, commitments and enthusiasm in research. Furthermore, effective supervision can help doctorate students to undertake challenging exercises while ensuring accessibility to expert's intellectual mentorship.

A study conducted by Mehr et al. (2015) found out that doctorate candidates are demoralized when faced with difficulties in the course of their study and they have no one to confide with. Good supervisory relationship helps in rediscovering new inspiring sources while creating a self-controlling structure. The doctorate supervisor will assist doctorate programme students set their goals and plan on how to achieve them together. The supervisor will further help in analyzing the doctorate candidate's responsibilities while evaluating progression of their research towards thesis completion. Universities need to put in place deliberate progress measuring tools which will sustain doctorate programme candidates on toes towards accomplishing research. In this context, doctorate supervision is more of mentorship than teaching. These programmes should enable doctorate programme students create arrangements which will grow their intellectual aptitudes, data finding abilities and data organisation skills. Consequently, academic supervisor remains central in all this coupled

with the nature of mentorship programmes they establish for their doctorate students. The result of all this is doctorate programme students acquiring pedagogical skills which will enable them to teach at undergraduate level and graduate courses.

The support supervisors extend to doctorate students has been established as being the critical ingredient to drive in research to successful end (Devos et al., 2017). In case of any discouraging attitude displayed by the supervisors through comments they give orally or in writing, mental stress is likely to spring up. The doctorate candidate will at this point think of dropping out of the programme (Grady et al., 2015). Moreover, they affirm that doctorate students experience personal challenges which stifle their intellectual growth hampering doctorate studies. Teklesellassie, 2019) further opine that doctorate supervisors' opinions and suggestions will influence the outcome of the doctorate research. However, they need to remain impartial and help the student in making decisions that will ensure realization of desired outcomes. Doctorate programme candidates need to not only maintain but also keep a sustained reflection of the supervisor's comments. Doctorate students should also respond to issues raised and within the timelines provided. Teklesellassie (2019), however, observes that heavy workloads coupled with personal engagements affects supervisor's punctuality in responding to students' work thus disadvantaging them. In most cases, the comments given by supervisors may be demanding or difficult to follow. At this point, the doctorate student need to arrange for a meeting where explanations pertaining the comments can be explained (Ward & Brennan, 2018).

Ives and Rowley (2005) in a study established that a positive supervisory rapport is connected with doctorate candidates' academic growth and contentment in the doctorate programme. This helps to encourages doctorate candidates to have a continuous and total involvement in their studies. Ray (2007) agrees with this and argues that successful doctorate students usually have supervisors who provide leadership and autonomy desirable to grow as academics. Woolderink et al. (2015) underscore the need for departments and schools to ensure that supervisors and doctorate students operate from a matching relationship. This forms a solid foundation to a fruitful outcome in the doctorate journey. This match of supervisor and student operates on the principle of socializer-socializee relationship. This study, however, did not isolate the key tenets which firm up this matching relationship. Consequently, supervisory rapport is a ground for facilitating disciplinary expectations and norms within a scholarly community through socialization between the doctorate student and the supervisor (Dysthe, 2006).

Masek (2017) in a qualitative study established that doctorate research supervision is not only an academic development but also a platform for establishing excellent supervisor-supervisee relationship. He identifies psychodynamic, system approach and developmental supervisory models in doctorate programme student research. Regarding doctorate research supervision styles. Masek (2017) identifies directorial-contractual, laisser-faire and structure-support supervision styles. The various issues with supervisors will often contribute to doctorate students arriving at a decision to either continue or discontinue with doctorate studies. Leijen et al. (2016) concurs and observes that it is not a surprise to understand that a supervisor is the most powerful person in doctorate studies. He or she will determine the fate

of the doctorate students or even the research outcome. This is because a supervisor controls the most important aspects of a doctorate programme while guiding the doctorate student. These will include influencing the integration into a department or school, doctorate topic selection and final product of the research thesis. The issues raised by these scholars are important. They have however not clearly stated how institutional practices regarding doctorate supervision influence enrolment and completion rates which is of concern to the current study.

Rooij et al. (2019) in a descriptive study obtained data from 839 respondents in Netherlands universities. The study found out that supervisory factors related to quantity and quality had ramifications on the enrolment and completion of doctorate programmes. They further established that research outcome in doctorate studies is a product of high rate of supervision. Thus, supervisors need to support their doctorate programme candidates for a fruitful and a successful navigation through the programme. They need to do this through giving academic support geared towards research with the aim of providing the best results. A contradictory understanding emerge from their observation when they underscore the element of autonomy for doctorate students without giving a clear definition. Furthermore, all these scholars have not identified the institutional practices related to supervision which will bring out best research outcomes in doctorate studies.

It is costly for doctorate students to be at cross purposes with supervisors which may cause friction resulting to difficulties in finding new supporting structures, isolation and confusion. Lauchlan (2019) in a study explains that doctorate students fear raising their concerns either to the supervisor or the university. This is because they are dogged by fear of the reprisals. They will rather address their issues anonymously. This can pose a challenge to doctorate candidates since proper guidance will miss. Abiddin et al. (2011) in a study established that cordial rapport between doctorate student and supervisor ensures successful completion of a research project. They further observed that an effective supervisor is critical in the study course and improve research growth (Abiddin et al. 2011). Therefore, the process of doctorate guidance calls for accommodation of the candidate's study interests. This will inspire and fortify the intrinsic desire of the candidate throughout the study period. The research will become exciting and this will sustain the student through the study period (Massyn, 2018). Doctorate student's motivation will ensure that the study becomes easy to manage and the rapport is good. This is supported by Ghani et al. (2012) who observe that supervisors oversee the student's research and provides advisory roles only.

According to Nerad (2006), friendly rapport between the supervisor and the student is critical for timely completion of writing a doctorate thesis. Doctorate thesis writing demands for advanced skills compared to the ones required for bachelor's thesis. Conversely, majority of doctorate candidates are ill-equipped with basic skills of underrating a doctorate research. Consequently, they are compelled to seek for assistance from doctorate thesis supervisors. Subject to the nature of guidance and excellence of mentorship, a doctorate programme research can lead to a satisfying and academically inspiring venture or be a terrifying one. Ho, Wong and Wong (2010) in a study linked distractions from doctorate study to a number of things such as leisure moments, life incidences, family issues which could lead to deferment

of studies or non-completion altogether. Moreover, Ho, Wong and Wong acknowledged issues like inability to grasp information related to doctorate programme procedures, inability to comprehend thesis configuration procedures and ineffective supervisor-student relationships as the highest obstacles to thesis completion.

A study carried out by Onabamiro and Onuka (2010) found out that thesis overseers without interest on doctorate student's study progress prompted to thesis delays. The study further established that the delays could be attributed to the high number of doctorate students that a single supervisor is allotted at any given time. The study concluded that indeed doctorate supervisors were overwhelmed by the amount of work apportioned to them and the expected outcomes.These conclusions are consistent with Wamala et al. (2012), who found out that universities offering doctorate programmes need to give strong therapeutic missions geared towards nurturing intellectual competence of fresh doctorate students especially those at the proposal development stage. It is valuable to doctorate programme students when their universities conduct seminars on data acquisition, carrying out research inquiry and writing academic work.

Linde (2012) underscores on the fact that both the student and their mentor should cultivate a collaborative approach in doctorate research project. Moreover, each one of these parties should endeavor to uphold the partnership. The supervisor endeavours to give expert opinion on the study as well as psychosocial support and the doctorate student must be ready to learn in a more receptive manner. White and Coetzee (2014) concur with this and explains that both the doctorate candidate and the supervisor should exhibit friendship. The student depends on the supervisor entirely for guidance in the research process and thesis writing. Therefore, both parties should strive to have one-on-one meetings to discuss the progress. However, in circumstances where it is impossible, they need to organise for online meetings. In this case, the supervisor needs to initiate the meeting to demonstrate friendliness to doctorate programme candidates.

Doctorate programme students are more anxious about the treatment they are likely to receive from those guiding them than what their research is all about. They view rapport with thesis supervisors more crucial and argue that information can easily be recovered if lost and not such with the relationships (Teklesellassie, 2019). It is, therefore, incumbent upon the universities' departments and schools to organise for activities which bring together supervisors and doctorate students to bond. Furthermore, doctorate students should be given a chance to choose both their topic of study and the supervisor who will guide them in the study based on their expertise and ability to work together (Ghani et al., 2012). While agreeing with this, Dinham and Scott (1999) observe that supervisor-supervisee relationship can be exciting or troublesome. This relationship has a consequence of lengthening the period of study at the doctorate programme or shortening it. Mouton and Cloete (2011) concurs with this by pointing out that lack of seriousness in doctorate supervision will lead to graduating half-baked doctorates. This is the case in the context of heightened demand to graduate more doctorate to mitigate the shortage in universities while those who are to train those doctorates never receive professional training.

This study sought to establish the dynamics in supervision that influences completion rates at doctorate level. The study traced various cohorts at their various stages of doctorate programme supervision. It also sought to establish the rapport exhibited by the doctorate candidates and their supervisors as well as the influence of such on doctorate programme studies particularly in selected Kenyan public universities.

4. Theoretical Framework

The study was guided by two theories namely; The Social Support Theory by Williams, Barclay and Schmied (2004) and the Involvement Theory by Astin (1984). The study used the two theories since doctorate degree studies could best be explained using the aspect of support a doctorate candidate gets and the extent to which such a student is involved in the studies particularly from the social environment. The Social Support Theory encapsulates the general support socially accorded to individuals; in this context, those enrolled for doctorate degree programmes. Furthermore, this entails the arrangements people have while communing with the larger society which contributes to happiness and bonding. The infrastructure here connected to the physical amenities and resources present in the universities offering doctorate programmes and how integrated the doctorate candidate is in the department or faculty hosting the programme which makes up the family and community respectively. It is, therefore, noted that isolation from these community pillars (department and faculty) leads to alienation. The Social Support Theory was utilised in the study to clarify the institutional practices influencing trends in doctorate enrolment and completion rates in selected Kenyan public universities. The theory emphasizes that providing support socially can take the practice of emotive care from supervisors together with other faculty members. This comprises of the warmth and nurturance doctorate students receive from academic advisors, the tangible support through scholarships, the informational support in coursework and thesis writing skills. Lack of institutional capacity and clear guidelines on how to integrate students into a doctorate programme would alienate them which would make them end up to silently withdraw or take long time to complete their degree course. This study, therefore, tried to determine the influence of social support leading to enrolment and completion rates among doctorate students.

The theory also looks at the concept of the socializer and the socializee. According to Thoits (1995), efficient 'collaborators' are individuals who already have gone through similar challenging situations to those in need of help. This would be pragmatic in twofold; first for doctorate degree holders, having successfully studied through the programme and graduated, secondly, the doctorate students who are in the process of studying for the doctorate degree. The doctorate students need the social support through mentorship programmes and participation in departmental activities. The doctorate degree supervisors who are the academic advisors play a key role in the institution to initiate doctorate students into the programme. They can assign them roles, guide them to participate in conferences and grooming them in presentation skills. This was of concern to the study in finding out the role institutions play and the kind of help they accorded doctorate students. It is worth noting that doctorate students are in much need of social support mechanisms to help them navigate through the doctorate studies which is highly multifaceted. The study looked at the social

support aspects that doctorate degree students required in the course of their studies that impact on completion rates.

The second theory is Astin's (1984) Theory of Involvement. This deals with how human beings are involved in doing activities in the society. The concept of involvement here referred to course or path taken in doctorate education or enrolment (Astin, 1993; Pascarella &Terenzini, 2005, Tinto, 1993). The theory operates on the ground that involvement requires an investment of psychosocial and physical energy doctorate student's direct toward their studies. The amount of investment directed by universities in management and governance of doctorate programmes, the processes involved in admitting doctorate degree students, the quality of staff both administrative and academic involved in running the doctorate programmes and regulations on students' status which were indicators of invaluable aspects of involvement.

Various scholars have applied this theory in doctorate education. Gardner (2007) underscored on the importance of doctorate candidates' involvement in expert's organizations which are appropriate to the areas they have selected to pursue as a way of intellectual participation. Tinto (1993) stressed on the fact that the process of interacting among the doctorate programme students as vital for their well-being. He further observed that interacting socially with the academic staff and fellow doctorate students is connected to their intellectual development and acquisition of critical skills to enable successful doctorate degree completion. These would include capabilities in proposal and thesis writing as well as doing projects which could attract funding in order to lessen the financial burden of the doctorate degree programme student. It is against this background that the association, knowledge and skills gained would determine completion rates at the doctorate level.

Tinto's statement is reinforced by Wenger (1996) who opine that the thoughts of learning and learning organization are interconnected at any given time. He further stated that, informal group exchanges are essential in imagination, being analytical, and gaining understanding through working together in varying contexts. Furthermore, Wenger asserts that, due to complex state of knowledge building process, group collaboration constitutes phenomenal resources of learning. This model of participation presents a wide spectrum within which to theorize and analyse doctorate degree programme education. This is achieved through gaining insights of enrolment and completion rates from the universities.

5. Findings

5.1 Doctorate Students' Demographic Information

The doctorate students' demographic data was considered vital because it has a link to the variables which influence enrolment and completion of the doctorate programmes. The demographic information obtained was gender and area of study, age and the mode the study was delivered through. The gender and academic programmes of doctorate students who took part in the research were also recorded. This would help establish their gender and doctorate programme of study distribution across schools and departments in the selected public universities in Kenya and how this influenced doctorate enrolment and completion from

public universities.

The gender dispersion of the doctorate programme students who took participated were: the A University had 76 and 84 male and female respondents, B University had 97 males and 68 females, University C had 69 males and 54 females University while D had 30 males and 24 females respondents respectively). Overall, the majority number of the doctorate programme students who were engaged in the study were male accounting for 54.18% whereas the female doctorate students were 45.82% of the students' respondents. This was summarized and presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Doctorate Candidates Respondents Percentage Distribution

University	Male	Female
University A	76	84
University B	97	68
University C	69	54
University D	30	24
Total	272	230
Percentage	**54.18**	**45.82**

Sources: Researcher's Fieldwork Analysis.

The doctorate candidate percentage distribution is in line with a study carried out by Yusuf, Felicia and Aina (2018) on demographic information. The study reported that in any study, the respondents' demographic information demonstrate whether they were representative enough. The percentage distribution confirms that the representation was sufficient for the study.

5.2 Age Bracket of the Doctorate Students

The study also sought to find out the age bracket of doctorate programme students. Data regarding the age of the doctorate programme students was considered significant since it envisages probable socioeconomic duties of the doctorate candidates, which may have influence on the enrolment into a doctorate degree programme and consequent time of completion. The researcher encountered difficulty in accessing admission data since part of the data was recorded and stored manually. This forced the researcher to engage a tracer tool to retrieve, collect and collate critical enrolment statistics. This led to the final number of the respondents for the current study as summarised in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Summary dispersion of age and gender of doctorate students.

Universities	UoN		KU		MU		EU		Totals		Percentage	
Gender	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**	M	F	M	F
18-28 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
29-39 years	12	13	18	21	19	15	9	7	58	56	21.32	24.35
40-49 years	51	56	63	39	36	28	13	11	163	134	59.93	58.26
Over 50 years	13	15	16	8	14	11	8	6	51	40	18.75	17.39
Totals	76	84	97	68	69	54	30	24	272	230	100.00	100.00

(Sources: Researcher's Fieldwork Analysis).

The data in Table 4 above indicates that the highest percentage (59.93% for males and for 58.26% females) of the doctorate students who took part in the study fall between 40-49 years. The findings that the average age for enrolling for doctorate studies is in agreement with Wamala, Ocaya and Oonyu (2012) whose study found out the median age when enrolling for doctorate studies to be 37 years while Jairam and Kahl (2012) established the median age to be 43 years. Those who fall between 29-39 years of age consisted of 21.32% males and 24.35% respectively. Those in the age bracket of 28-38years of age were considered young and majority may be settling down in life therefore doctorate degree programme may not be of priority to them.

Table 5. Position of Responsibility held by the academic staff

Position	Universities					Percentage%
	University A	University B	University C	University D	Totals	
Deans/Director BPS	4	4	4	4	16	19.75
HODs/COD	2	2	2	2	8	9.88
Departmental doctorate Programme Coordinators	1	2	2	2	7	8.64
Lecturers	11	17	13	9	50	61.73
Totals	**18**	**25**	**21**	**17**	**81**	**100.00**

Sources: Universities' HR Department.

According to data in Table 5 the majority of the respondents comprising of 61.73% were lecturers while deans were 19.75% of the respondents, the heads of departments consisted of 9.88% while departmental doctorate programme coordinators formed 8.64% of the respondents.

5.3 Doctorate Programme Supervision Process and Doctorate Completion

To establish how institutional doctorate degree supervision practices influence doctorate completion in selected Kenyan public universities, nine (9) items were offered to the doctorate students and another set of eleven (11) items presented to the lecturers in the selected public universities in Kenya. Each of these set of respondents were required to rate the statements which were aimed at establishing the role of supervision process and practices influencing doctorate programmes enrolment and completion rates at Kenyan public universities. This was based on the Likert Scale which is: 4= Strongly Agree (SA), 3=Agree, 2=Disagree (D) and 1= Strongly Disagree (SD). Their responses were presented in two separate tables for doctorate students and lecturers in table 6 and 7respectively.

Table 6. Doctorate Students' responses on supervision and Completion rates

S/N	Item	SA		A		D		SD	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
i.	Good rapport between supervisor and doctorate student is a critical element.	253	50.40	196	39.04	22	4.38	31	6.18
ii.	Inadequate guidance on topic selection by supervisors may lead to delays	261	51.99	201	40.04	16	3.19	24	4.78
iii.	There is need to increase the number of the faculty in the schools to boost supervision	193	38.44	176	35.06	54	10.77	79	15.74
iv.	Supervisors lack adequate contact time with the supervisee which may lengthen completion period	273	54.38	198	39.44	13	2.59	18	3.59
v.	Doctorate programme policies need to be revised to reflect current needs	166	33.07	152	30.28	89	17.73	95	18.92
vi.	Departments and schools need to enhance their mentoring skills	213	42.43	176	35.06	62	12.35	51	10.16
vii.	The mode of study influences completion rates?	255	50.80	102	20.32	66	13.14	79	15.74
viii.	Supervisors' motivation is poor.	266	53.00	193	38.45	19	3.78	24	4.77
ix.	Supervisors take long to response to doctorate student's work	254	50.60	197	39.24	18	3.59	33	6.57

(Sources: Fieldwork Analysis)

The study sought to find out the influence of supervisor-supervisee relationship on enrolment and completion rates of the doctorate programmes. The respondents were required to state if the rapport between the supervisor and supervisee had a direct impact on enrolment and

completion. The responses of the study participants were as follows: 253 respondents representing 50.40% strongly agreed that the rapport between the two is critical while 39.04% agreed. Good rapport enhanced participation and the consequence of such engagement is high completion rates. The doctorate students observed that cordial working relationship between the doctorate students and their supervisors leads to willingness and motivation on the side of the supervisor to mentor the doctorate student. The study therefore established that there are supervision variables from the students' perspective which have a direct influence on doctorate programme completion. The one cited by students include the rapport and type of supervision. The findings concur with Leijen et al. (2016) who reported in a study that school and departmental cultural challenges related to doctorate supervision relationships often contribute to the decision to quit from a doctorate programme. They reported that this could be accelerated by family, work and personal challenges. This was supported by a doctorate student from University B who observed that:

"*The culture of supervisor allocation in my department is not friendly. As a candidate, you are not given a chance to choose the person whom you may work with a lot more cooperation. The department chooses for you and there the challenges begin" A doctorate student from University B" (RS/41/DCSEM/SOE/BU)*

When asked whether inadequate guidance on the thesis topic selection may lead to delays, majority of the doctorate students who include 261 out of 502 respondents representing 51.99% strongly agreed that it would lead to delays. The doctorate students observed that they usually have an idea of what they need to study while the supervisors possess the way such a study will be structured. They observed that, they had to propose a number of topics before they settled on one of them. One of the doctorate students from University D noted that:

"I made several topic proposals before one was accepted. One of my supervisors had a fixed mind on what he wanted me to research on. He argued that he wanted me to research on an area where funding was available. He was more interested in acquiring funding using me and not concerned on what I had passion to study on. This brought a sense of frustration to me from the word go." A doctorate student from University D (RS/15/DPHY/SPAS/DU)

The finding from the current study is in agreement with Devos et al. (2017) which established that the support offered by supervisors to doctorate students is perceived as the driver of continued progress and success in a doctorate programme. This is supported by Grady et al. (2015) who reported that unsupportive supervisory roles like delays and inappropriate feedback will delay the process of doctorate programme. This is further supported by Teklesellassie (2019) who reported in a study that any existence of perceived development of social-psychological and academic conflicts will strain the candidates' progress in doctorate research. Therefore, the role of supervisors in research supervision is so critical in determining the outcomes and should be emphasized from the onset of the project for the smooth running of the study. The doctorate students noted that guidance is important in ensuring that steadfast progress during a doctorate programme is achieved. These aforementioned conclusions are consistent with other studies' findings such as Barnes & Austin (2009) who established that efficient leadership by the supervisors is a crucial

ingredient towards completing a doctorate programme in a timely and fashionable manner.

Similarly, Nerad and Miller (1996) in a study emphasized that the type of guidance offered greatly influences the doctorate students' research progress. This means that inadequate doctorate student guidance hampers timely doctorate completion. Additionally, if a supervisor places the burden of thesis writing exclusively in the hands of the doctorate student, it will take very long to complete writing it. Ray (2007) supports the findings by underscoring that efficacious doctorate candidates were paired with thesis supervisors who accorded valuable guidance and autonomy to develop as scholars.

The appropriate doctorate student guidance is closely tied with cordial working relationships. The respondents observed that when supervisors-supervisees enjoy a good rapport, greater academic success is achieved. They further observed that frustrations can emerge from the way a supervisor packages and presents comments for the doctorate student. A doctorate student from university D supported this by observing that:

"W*hat caused delays and frustration on me was the lack of consistency in comments given by my supervisors ...on one hand, one of them would say the work is okay, while on the other hand, the co-supervisor would rubbish my work. The worst could be when he could not provide an alternative idea of what I should do and how to present it or even guiding me on what type of academic resources I could use……Indeed and for sure, one needs a big heart to have such a person as a supervisor and to balance his attitude with the one who would guide you that things are okay, then be sure on the next steps to undertake.....without this one can easily give up…*" A doctorate student from University D *(RS/15/DPHY/SPAS/DU)*

This sentiments by (RS/15/DPHY/SPAS/DU) from University D are supported by Spaulding and Rockinson-Szapkiw (2012) who identified students' inherent qualities and their ability to seek information, the supervisor-supervisee relationship and their scholarly environment as well as the quality of research facilities as the main factors that determines a student's progress in a doctorate degree programme.

A further question was posed to the doctorate students on the need to increase the number of faculty in the schools selected to boost supervision. 38.44% of the respondents strongly agreed while 35.06% were in agreement for the need to enhance the number of qualified supervisors. Tied to this was the aspect of supervisor- supervisee contact time. 54.38% strongly agreed while 39.440% of the respondents agreed that lecturers lacked adequate contact time with doctorate students they supervised. They noted that most lecturers complain of being overworked and this took long to read and respond to their work in time. This also reduced the supervisor-supervisee contact time which had a direct impact on the length of time the doctorate programme could take. The student respondents also noted that because of the excess amount of work and probably due to poor remuneration, the lecturers lacked motivation. All these had a consequence of lengthening the period of study thus impacting on the completion rates. The doctorate respondents observed the following;

"Whenever I make efforts to meet my supervisor something would always crop up about his availability and unscheduled meetings, sometimes the meetings would be out of town and he

will be unavailable for long and when he is on campus, he would be from one meeting to another and if not then the rest of the time he will be in class" a doctorate respondent – university D *(RS/28/DPHY/SPAS/DU)*

"I have a cordial relationship with my supervisors, while they are often available the workload is visible as you would hear them mention about past due reports and reviews, a number of my colleagues are way behind schedule as their supervisors are overwhelmed by administrative and other engagements."- A doctorate respondent – the University A *(RS/15/CS/FE/DU)*

The current study established that doctorate programme students' experiences of their supervisors being uncooperative, aloof and rigid, and having a negative attitude towards them were expressed through interviews. These is supported by Clerehan et al. (2012) who in a study found out that many doctorate students felt that their lecturers were distant, unreachable, and unsociable. Furthermore, Wadesango and Machingambi (2011) concur with the importance of support from the supervisors by clarifying that the sufficient number of supervisors for a doctorate programme is fundamental to progress and completion of the doctorate programme.

Furthermore, doctorate students were asked to comment on the need to revise doctorate programme supervision policies. 33.07% strongly agreed while 30.28% agreed that they need to be revised. These policies need to be revised in order to match the student and supervisor needs. A doctorate students observed that:

There is need to encourage open policies where doctorate students do not feel intimidated whenever they point out challenges they face with their supervisors and the supervision process. Sometimes, I experience difficulties to share my challenges. This act disempowers me from proactively engaging with my supervisors. I fear repercussions of victimization' a doctorate student from University C (RS/15/CS/FE/CU)

This would eliminate the insecurity experienced by doctorate students who fear reprisals from their supervisors. Doctorate students singled out conflict with their supervisors if they raised challenges. They further observed that they are subordinate and in a dependent positions to their supervisors and the universities in academics and social growth. This is in agreement with a study by Metcalfe et al. (2018) who argued that doctorate students fear raising the problems they meet in the course of their doctorate programme to their supervisors or the university. Students in the current study explained through an interview that universities are not ready to listen and address their doctorate challenges related to supervision. They instead blame it all on the doctorate programme students.

"As a doctorate student, I gave up presenting any grievances I may have to either my supervisors, department or school management. I tried at the initial stage of my doctorate programme and nothing was being done. At some point, the very information I shared in confidence to an officer in my department was shared. I learnt this when one of my supervisors casually commented that there is nothing I could do, he is the boss….. quite frustrating. Tell me at that point if it were you, could you try to make any request to the

university? I belief, most doctorate students are intimidated and frustrated." University C (RS/15/CS/FE/CU)

Another item presented to the doctorate students was on whether the mode of study had an impact on the enrolment and completion of the doctorate programme. There was consensus that indeed the mode of study has a direct impact. Majority of doctorate students representing 50.80% strongly agreed while 20.32% agreed that the mode of study had an impact of doctorate completion. Through interview, most of the doctorate students observed that they were either tutorial fellows, research assistants or teachers. Those working as tutorial fellows complained of having been assigned a lot of responsibilities which reduced the time, they spent in doing their studies. Teachers preferred school-based programmes to pursue their doctorate programmes. Besides, they had responsibilities at their place of work as well as family obligations. All these delayed their progress in studies. They observed the following;

"The position I hold in my capacity as a tutorial fellow has made my life hectic. I am expected to teach a number of units per semester in a large class, assigned marking and carry out other departmental responsibilities such as time tabling. This is further complicated by my status as a family man. All these have driven me crazy as a student and thus prolonging my stay in the university". A doctorate student from university *A (RS/15/CS/FE/CU)*

The doctorate students were further asked to comment on whether schools and departments undertook mentoring programmes. The satisfaction index of those who strongly agreed that they were involved in mentorship programmes such as presenting conference papers and how to write proposals was at 42.43% with those agreeing being 35.06% while there are those who strongly disagreed that universities have not done much in enabling them to acquire new skills regarding their area of study based on their interests accounted for 10.16% and disagreeing being 12.35%. Similarly, doctorate students were asked to rate the supervisors' motivation. An overwhelming majority 53.00% strongly agreed while 38.45% of the respondents agreed that indeed their supervisors' motivation was extremely poor. This was linked to a question of how long the supervisors took to respond to their work. Majority of the doctorate students 50.60% strongly agreed while 39.24% agreed that it took long for them to respond to their work. When enquiring from their lecturers, one of them observed that:

"Time is often very limited and there is often a lot of work to do, coupled with Masters and Doctorate dissertations, there is hardly enough time…though I understand that universities are doing the best they can to ensure the staff capacity is at optimum…however, they often have a shortage in staffing at one point or another." Lecturer at the University A (RS/20/CS/FE/UA)

This observation is in agreement with a study by Prazeres (2017) who found out that the role of a supervisor is multifaceted with complex responsibilities which may take long to be achieved. The length has an impact on the doctorate student too since it will take relatively long to respond to the work.

Table 7. Lecturers' responses on doctorate supervision and Completion rate

S/N	Item	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Good rapport between supervisor and doctorate student is a critical element.	42	51.85	21	25.93	11	13.58	7	8.64
2	Inadequate doctorate student guidance on topic selection, concept paper writing and proposal development by supervisors may lead to delays	34	41.97	28	34.57	13	16.05	6	7.41
3	Enhance the number of individuals with suitable qualifications in Departments and schools to boost supervision	43	53.09	22	27.16	9	11.11	7	8.64
4	Supervisors lack adequate contact time with the supervisee which may lengthen completion	27	33.33	23	28.40	12	14.81	19	23.46
5	Doctorate programme policies need to be revised to reflect current needs	41	50.62	29	35.80	6	7.41	5	6.17
6	Departments and schools need to enhance their doctorate programmes mentoring skills	44	54.32	22	27.16	8	9.88	7	8.64
7	The mode of study influences completion rates?	31	38.27	19	23.46	14	17.29	17	20.98
8	Supervisors' motivation is poor.	47	58.02	31	38.27	2	2.47	1	1.23
9	Lecturers are overwhelmed by duties besides doctorate supervision	46	56.79	30	37.04	1	1.23	4	4.94
10	Doctorate Students don't take supervision instructions seriously	37	45.68	25	30.86	9	11.11	10	12.35
11	Students take long to respond or sometimes disappear completely.	45	55.56	17	20.98	8	9.88	11	13.58

(Sources: Fieldwork Analysis).

Table 7 above represents the responses by the lecturers on doctorate supervision and completion rates. The lecturers were asked to rate the importance of the good rapport between the doctorate student and their supervisors. 51.85% of the lecturers strongly agreed while 25.95% of the lecturers agree with the statement. On the other hand, 8.64% of the lecturers strongly disagreed while 13.58% disagreed. Those who strongly agreed observed that the influence of doctorate student's supervisory perceptions on their interpersonal style with their supervisors greatly impacted on the doctorate progression. They argued that without good working relationship, the students feel out of place and are not content with their skills especially when developing a proposal and final thesis writing. Some students feel humiliated when corrected by their supervisors which keeps them at bay. These findings are in agreement with studies by Bui (2014) and Golding (2017) who recognized four key themes related to supervisor-supervisee relationship. These are: perceived role of the supervisors and their expectations, the intellectual capabilities of the doctorate student from the supervisors' point of view, the logistical and emotional expectations. The supervisors ought to provide guidance all through the course of doctorate studies and help mitigate challenges experienced by the supervisee. This was closely connected to the item on topic selection by the students they supervise. 41.97% of the lecturers strongly agreed while 34.75% agreed that inadequate guidance on topic selection through to thesis writing and final submission will lead to delays. Only 7.41% strongly disagreed while 16.05% disagreed. Through interaction with lecturers, they underscored that it is the student who selects what they need to study and write on. That lecturers only offer guidance based on what the student chose to research on particularly on thesis writing process.

One of the lecturer from University B noted that;

"In my so many years in academia and as a professor, there are lessons I have learnt, but the most important is that my job requires I be a role model to mentor upcoming scholars. While this is not part of my job description, I desire when I retire someone good enough to take up this job and do it well….some of my colleagues are not persuaded in my vision and thoughts which at times leads to conflict with students…but sometimes students need to be a bit patient and willing to be guided and mentored rather than have a know it all attitude…"A professor from University A (RL/20/EF/SoE/UB).

When the lecturers were asked to respond to the item on whether to increase the faculty to enhance supervision, they strongly agreed at 53.09% while those who agreed with the statement were 27.16%. Lecturers observed that public universities are seriously understaffed while adding that they are overwhelmed by the responsibilities they undertake at the schools and departments. They noted that the student-faculty ratio was beyond recommended ratio. In support of this and according to the Ministry of Education (2012), the country's university education system is expected to create sustainable pools of highly trained human resources equipped with the skills required for the country to experience socioeconomic development and to remain globally competitive in a rapidly changing and more diverse economy. This will enable the country to actualize the national ambition of being a knowledge-based economy. Given the centrality of (university) education in Kenya's development, the government has, since independence, invested heavily in all sectors of education with the

goal to widen access at all levels. To establish this, Table 8 below indicates the staff establishment against the students serviced from undergraduate to doctorate.

Table 8. Faculty to Student Ratio

University	Staff (Professor, Senior lecturer, Lecturers & TF)	undergraduate	Undergraduate Ratio	Masters& Doctorate	Staff (Professor, Senior lecturer & Lecturers)	Masters & Doctorate Ratio
UoN	**149**	13,112	1:88	1,208	77	1:16
KU	**158**	14,331	1:91	1,214	75	1:17
MU	**126**	6,326	1:51	821	70	1:12
EU	**97**	5,587	1:58	787	55	1:15

Source: Universities Admission Records 2019.

Table 8 indicates the number of students distributed per university where the study took place in the schools and departments selected. Based on this, faculty-student ratio was computed. At University A, the ratio of faculty to students at undergraduate level was 1:88 while at B University undergraduate, the ratio was 1:91. C University had a ratio of 1:51 at the undergraduate level and D University had a ratio of 1:58 in the sampled schools and departments respectively. These findings established that at each of the sampled universities, the undergraduate faculty to student ratio was way high than the recommended ratio by the Universities Standards and Guidelines PROG/STD/17. The guidelines recommends that for undergraduate, the ratio ought to be 1:10 for the applied Sciences, 1:15 Arts and Humanities, 1:7 Medical and Allied Sciences, 1:10 Pure and Natural Sciences and a further 1:18 Social Sciences. Furthermore, for masters and doctorate students, a separate computation was done since the lecturers and professors are the only ones entitled to teach and supervise these cadre of students. The University A was found to have 1:16, B University had a ratio of 1:17, and C University had a ratio 1:12 while University D had a ratio of 1:15. The Universities Standards and Guidelines PROG/STD/17 recommends a ratio of 1:5 and 1:3 Masters and Doctorate supervision respectively. This was interpreted to mean that one lecturer will examine approximately 15 theses. When calculated on average, the overall faculty-student ratio stood at 1:157. This meant that a single lecturer handles 157 students (undergraduate, masters and doctorate levels). This is besides other responsibilities that they perform within the university. Findings from the foregoing discussion indicates that selected Kenyan public universities are seriously understaffed. The selected universities are the oldest in terms of establishment, the largest in terms of population and have the highest number of doctorate programmes, ought to have the highest number of lecturers with doctorate (professors and lecturers). The result

indicates otherwise which means that the ratio could be higher in other public universities. This has a direct impact on enrolment and completion of the doctorate programmes. Based on the recommendations by Commission for University Education of faculty to doctorate student ratio and the actual situation at the universities concerning the number of faculty with doctorates, it is imperative that universities should strive to increase the faculty numbers by 150%-200% in order to match the need.

The lecturers were asked to comment on adequacy of contact time between the supervisor and supervisee. On contact time between doctorate students and their supervisors, 33.33% of the lecturers strongly agreed that there was inadequate contact time while 28.40% agreed. The findings were interpreted to mean that doctorate students rarely meet with their supervisors. Doctorate students noted that every time they seek for supervisor's audience, they are told that they are busy or engaged elsewhere. Through the interviews with the respondents, they observed the following;

As a lecturer, I hardly have time to meet and discuss with my doctorate students. Whenever they want to see me, I am either in a meeting or handling undergraduate lecture or meeting with masters students who are many as opposed to this single doctorate student. 'Lecturer from University D (RL/15/CS/FE/DU)

Another lecturer noted that:

'These doctorate students always never turn up whenever I have time. They just pop-up when I am heading for a crucial meeting. I have little I can do at that time.' A Professor from University C (RL/15/CS/FE/CU)

The study sought to find out what were the views of the lecturers with regard to reviewing of the doctorate programme policies. 50.62% strongly agreed with the statement while 35.80% agreed. This findings is in agreement with Harley (2020) who underscores the need for enhanced institutional doctorate programme procedures and policies with the intended outcome of high quality of individual doctorate graduate achievement. This was tied to an item on the need to enhance doctorate mentorship programme within their universities. 54.32% strongly agreed with the statement while277.16% agreed. The lecturers indicated that there was some mentorship programmes offered for doctorate students. This was in form of presenting papers and attending conferences. One of the lecturers, in the course of the interview noted that,

"For the period I have been supervising my doctorate students, I always inform them of the available opportunities such as academic paper presentation and seminar attendance within the university and even beyond. I recall to have co-authored papers and watching them present. If this is not mentorship, then I don't understand what that is" A lecturer from University D (RL/17/CS/FECD/DU)

In the course of carrying out interviews and interacting with the respondents, the researcher observed that universities occasionally organize for workshops and trainings where doctorate candidates receive critical skills on how to progress with their studies. Scholars who have considered mentorship programmes during doctorate studies have also underscored on the

need to have a close working relationship between the supervisor and supervisee. This observation is augmented by Curtin, Malley and Stewart (2016), who state that interactions between different types of mentoring programmes was critical for doctorate students. These were linked to doctorate programmes' goals, career interests, and self-efficacy of the doctorate student. They acknowledged and emphasized on active mentoring which is composed of training in research ethics, research methods, content and procedures in doctorate programmes.

They further found out that effort must be geared towards ensuring that the mentee was rendered openings to study what they need to know. Further, the lecturers were asked to comment on whether the mode of study influenced doctorate enrolment and completion rates. 38.27% of the lecturers strongly agreed that indeed the mode of study had a direct impact while 23.46% agreed. They noted that majority of their doctorate students were working class people who enrolled for part-time mode of study. They had both job and family responsibilities which took much of their time. Some of them had other businesses beyond the job and family. This meant that they had divided attention and their studies would not take precedence. Tied to this was the item on whether lecturers' motivation was poor. 58.02% strongly agreed while 38.27% of the lecturers who responded agreed. The lecturers noted that they were poorly remunerated whenever they supervise doctorate students. They felt that supervision process especially at doctorate level was an extra duty which required universities to pay for. An interview with an academic member of staff stated as follows:

"I speak on behalf of myself and many others, while supervising a doctorate candidate is good for my career growth, there is little benefit attached to it. This is in addition to other responsibilities that I have in terms of running various functions as assigned, and lecture at times from bachelors' students all through to doctorate candidates. Universities must have tutorial fellows to work under their professors so that they get the right skills while easing the burdens that we carry. Consider that I have both masters and doctorate candidates to supervise. Don't you think that is too much? In any case, doctorate scholars should handle most of this by themselves" A lecturer from University C (RL/8/CS/FE/CU)

Data collected indicated that there were payments for thesis examination however for those who supervise, they are encouraged to do so for their career growth. Further tied to this was whether lecturers were overwhelmed with duties. 56.79% of the lecturers strongly agreed that they were overwhelmed while 37.04% agreed with the statement. This is in line with the earlier findings on this study that faculty student ratio was wide and not favorable. They furthermore observed that doctorate students don't take instructions. This was observed by 45.68% who strongly agreed while 37.04% agreed with the statement. 55.56% strongly agreed that doctorate students are given comments on their work yet they take long to respond. That some disappear for months, even years and only resurface abruptly and need instant reviews for personal gains especially those employed as tutorial fellows and need appraisals at certain periods of time. Lecturers further observed that they always give comments to the doctorate students which they hardly follow.

6. Conclusion

Institutional doctorate supervision practices influence doctorate degree programme completion. Qualified supervisors were found to be inadequate while coupled with heavy administrative responsibilities besides teaching loads. This greatly affected their availability for doctorate students. The study further concluded that supervisors are poorly remunerated which has affected their motivation. The study also concluded that cordial supervisor-supervisee relationship will help the doctorate student to navigate through the doctorate programme successfully. That effective supervision is critical in guiding doctorate programme study progress. Through improving supervisory approach, supervisors will definitely bolster the doctorate study process.

7. Recommendations

Doctorate supervision need to be enhanced. Supervisors need to be motivated highly through proper remuneration. Thesis examination process requires universities to set aside enhanced budget to cater for this. There is also need for universities to bolster principles that guide thesis development and the university should make it a policy for the two supervisors to meet together with the student like the way they meet in class for certain percentage of meetings for harmony and agreement between the two. The commission should also have policies that supervisors should follow to ensure that they produce candidates that are learned and they finish their thesis in time.

References

Abiddin, N. Z., Affero, I., & Azahari, I. (2011). Effective Supervisory Approach in Enhancing Postgraduate Research Studies. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 1*(2), 206-2217.

Astin, A. (1984). Student Involvement: A Developmental Theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, 518-529.

Astin, A. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for Higher Education. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*, 518-529.

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bourhis, A. (2014). *M.sc supervisory relationship. Implementation guide for professors and students*. HEC Montreal: HEC Montreal Program Office.

Delany, D. (2013). *A review of the literature on effective PhD supervision*. Dublin: University of Dublin, Trinity College.

Dericks, G. T. (2019). Determinants of PhD student satisfaction: the roles of supervisor, department, and peer qualities. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44*(7), 1053-1068. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1570484

Devos, C. B. (2017). Doctoral students' experiences leading to completion or attrition: A

matter of sense, progress and distress. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 6*, 61-77. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-016-0290-0

Devos, C., Boudrenghien, G., Van der Linden, N., Azzi, A., Frenay, M., Galand, B., & Klein, O. (2017). Doctoral students' experiences leading to completion or attrition: A matter of sense, progress and distress. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 32*(1), 61-77. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-016-0290-0

Dimitrova, R. (2016). Ingredients of good Phd supervision- Evidence from a student survey at Stockholm University. *Utbildning & Lärande, 10*(1), 40-52.

Firoz, A. Q. (2013). A pilot study on postgraduate supervision. *Procedia Engineering, 4*, 875-881. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2013.03.210

Ghani, N. A. (2012). Effective supervision from research students' perspective. *International Journal of Education, 3*(2), 230-246. https://doi.org/10.5296/ije.v4i2.1531

Kiplagat, H., Ferej, A., & Kafu, P. (2018). Institution-based factors influencing trainees' completion rate in vocational training centres in Kenya: A case of selected counties. *Journal of African Studies in Educational Management and Leadership, 9*(2), 5-19.

Kosgei. P. K. (2021). *Student-supervisor interaction in graduate studies in public universities in Kenya* (Unpublished doctoral thesis), Moi University, Kenya.

Linde, A. S. (2012). *Supervisor-student relationships: A leadership model for enhancing postgraduate research at a university of technology*. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State.

Masek, B. (2017). Establishing supervisor-students' relationships through mutual expectation: A study from supervisors' point of view. *International Research and Innovation Summit (IRIS2017), 226*, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/226/1/012200

Massyn, L. (2018). Enhancing completion rates of mini-dissertations for a professional master's degree: An integrated approach. *The International Journal of Management Education, 6*, 114-120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2018.01.002

Matheka, H. M., Jansen, E. P., & Hofman, W. A. (2020a). Ph.D students' background and program characteristics as related to success in Kenyan universities. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 15*(1), 57-75. https://doi.org/10.28945/4467

Matheka, H. M., Jansen, E. P., & Hofman, W. A. (2020b). Kenyan doctoral students' success: Roles of motivation and self-efficacy. *Perspectives in Education, 38*(1), 115-129. https://doi.org/10.18820/2519593X/pie.v38i1.9

Matheka, H. M., Jansen, E. P., & Hofman, W. H. (2020). Phd Students'background and Program Characteristics as related to success in Kenyan universities. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 15*(1), 27-36. https://doi.org/10.28945/4467

Mehr, K. E. (2015). Factors influencing trainee willingness to disclose in supervision. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 9*(1), 44-56.

https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000028

Momanyi C. (2022). Strategic factors influencing the completion rate of doctoral studies in Kenya: A case of selected public universities in Kenya. *African Journal of Emerging Issues (AJOEI), 4*(1), 27-46.

Mugendi, S., & Githae, E. (2021). Relationship between psychological distress and non completion among postgraduate students in selected public universities in Kenya. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 2*(1), 43-51.

Mukhwana, E. J. (2017). Transforming university education in Africa: Lessons from Kenya. *African Journal of Rural Development, 2*(3), 341-352.

Mukhwana, E., Oure, S., Too, J., & Some, D. K. (2016). State of Postgraduate Research Training in Kenya. *Commission for University Education* (p. 3). Discussion Paper 02. Nairobi, Kenya.

Munim, Z. H., & Schramm, H. J. (2018). The impacts of port infrastructure and logistics performance on economic growth: the mediating role of seaborne trade. *Journal of Shipping and Trade, 3*(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41072-018-0027-0

Nerad, M. (2006). Increasing student retention in graduate and professional programs. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 1996*(92), 61-76. https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.37019969207

Onuka A. O. U., & Onabamiro, A. (2010). Challenges of educational research and evaluation. A paper presented at *WARIMA 2010 conference in Nov. 27th - Dec. 2nd, 2010.* (pp. 1-10). Monrovia, Liberia: WARIMA.

Orodho, A. J. (2008). *Techniques of Writing Research Proposals and Reports: In Education and Social Sciences*. Maseno, Kenya: Kenzia Publishers.

Pakdaman, S. S. (2015). Ethics in supervision: Consideration of the supervisory alliance and countertransference management of psychology doctoral students. *Ethics & Behavior, 25*(5), 427-441. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2014.947415

Rigler Jr, K. L., Bowlin, L. K., Sweat, K., Watts, S., & Throne, R. (2017). *Agency, socialization, and support: A critical review of doctoral student attrition*. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED580853.pdf

Rooij, E. F.-B. (2019). Factors that influence PhD candidates' success: The importance of PhD project characteristics. *Studies in Continuing Education, 1*(1), 1-20.

Rugut, C. K. (2017). *The nature of graduate student-supervisor relationship in the completion of doctoral studies in education: An exploration in two African universities* (Unpublished MA Thesis),

Taylor, S. K. (2017). *A handbook for doctoral supervisors*. Routledge: Routledge.

Teklesellassie, Y. (2019). Views of summer TEFL postgraduate students and their supervisors

on the practice of thesis supervision in the Ethiopian context. *Pasaa, 5*, 131-165.

Van der Laan, L. O. (2021). The higher degree by research student as 'master': Utilising a design thinking approach to improve learner experience in higher degree research supervision. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice, 18*(1), 41-49.

Wamala, R. &. (2012). Extended candidature and non-completion of a PhD at Makerere university, Uganda. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research, 5*(3), 175-184. https://doi.org/10.19030/cier.v5i3.7094

Wenger, E. (1996). Communities of practice: The social fabric of the learning organization. HealthCare Forum Journal, 39(4), 20-26.

White, T. (2014). Postgraduate supervision:E-mail as an alternative. *Africa Education Review, 11*(4), 658-673. https://doi.org/10.1080/18146627.2014.935010