Factors Affecting Completion of Graduate Studies in Public Universities: A Case Study of University of Kabianga, Kenya

Dr. Williter Chepkemoi Rop PhD[1], Dr Eric Mibei PhD[2]

[1]University of Kabianga, Department of Marketing, Management Science, Tourism and Hospitality

[2]University of Kabianga, Department of Clinical Medicine

ABSTRACT

The study examined the factors affecting completion of graduate studies in public universities in Kenya. Stakeholders have been in dilemma on what really contributes to graduate students graduating after stipulated programme time. This study therefore sought to determine the factors affecting completion of graduate studies in public universities a case study of University of Kabianga, Kenya. Specifically it examined student, supervisor and institutional factors role in completion of graduate studies. The study findings are very important in informing and suggesting actions to address the delays. The study used descriptive research design. The target population was 303 and a sample of 33% was randomly selected to respond to questionnaires. A total of 100 questionnaires were distributed but 64 questionnaires were returned comprising a response rate of about 64% which is an acceptable rate and was therefore considered adequate to carry out the analysis and make conclusions. Descriptive statistics in form of frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviation was used to analyze the data and results presented in tables. The study established that financial constraints, job related assignment and duties, students' own commitment, academic and research environment, lack of motivation, post-marriage domestic responsibilities, poor guidance in topic selection, inability to use modern tools of communication, imposing of research topics by supervisors, lack of preparation and poor language skills affect postgraduate students completion of their studies on time. The recommendation of the study is for the students, supervisors and institution to address the challenges identified in order to improve graduate studies completion on stipulated programme time.

Key Terms: completion of graduate studies, student factors, supervisor factors, institutional factors

INTRODUCTION

Students are the key players in the successful completion of their studies and their persistent effort is vital to graduate on time (Eyangu, Bagire & Kibrai, 2014). Siamian, Mahmoudi, Habibi, Latifi & Zare-Gavgani (2016) succinctly pointed out that students with a relatively high level of perception of awareness towards the challenging academic life were able to develop better academic and non-academic related skills and were successful in the submission of their thesis. However, a substantial number of studies have investigated the factors affecting the graduate students' thesis completion and concluded that graduate students were constantly facing multiple challenges in their research journey.

A study by Vasugi and Hassan (2019) reported that postgraduate students from a Malaysian public university displayed a moderate level of stress, anxiety and depression. Numerous studies highlighted a range of issues and barriers faced by postgraduate students which were primarily related to attitude (Siamian et al., 2016), thesis writing skills (Hoon et al., 2019), psychological factors (Tinto, 2006), family (Girves &

Wammerus, 1988) and finance (Mbogo, 2016). In addition, it was identified that graduate students had encountered intensive personal problems which was the highly rated constraint in thesis completion (Russell, 1996). In a similar vein, Hadi & Muhammad (2019) concluded that graduate students' personal factors largely influence their research progress. This confirmed that students undergo a myriad of personal and research related challenges during the period of postgraduate study and they need to manage and overcome these challenges.

An institution has been recognised as a crucial factor in the completion of postgraduate studies. The literature has referred the term for institutional support as the availability of academic resources, student support system and guidance both in-campus and on-line (Rubin, Fernandes & Avgerinou, 2013) and the opportunity for creating a learning community. Several studies have reported that the issues faced by postgraduate students were due to lack of facilities in library services, which subsequently affect the research progress of the postgraduate students. Many supervisors have reiterated the concern over the lack of institutional support and the need for better institutional services and practices to be available for postgraduate students' research work (Sidhu, Lim & Chan, 2017).

Supervision is conceptualized as a complex and multidimensional task where one-to-one conscious interaction occurs between the student and the supervisor with mutual respect, collegiality, professionalism and open-mindedness. The supervisor-student relationship is viewed as a symbiotic relationship in a professional environment for mutual benefits. Research supervision involves academic expertise and skillful management of interpersonal and professional relationships. Whilst many factors contribute to postgraduate students' programme completion, one of the potential factors which is widely scrutinized is supervisory practices. Abiddin, Ismail and Ismail (2011) have reported that having a good relationship with supervisors is important for students' study progress and successful completion of research projects. Mhunpiew (2013) viewed supervision as a system which constitutes supervisors to offer five desirable supports to their supervisees which are; technical, intellectual, administrative, management, and personal support. Other than the epistemic domain of knowledge and skills, the affective qualities are considered vital for supervisors.

The supervisors' non-authoritative approach with respect and empathy; persistent support and encouragement as an academic advisor; keeping up the students' self- respect and morality (Phillips & Pugh, 2000); being sensitive to students' needs (Brown & Krager,1985), pastoral care and support (Cryer, 2006), and good communication skills (Haksever & Manisali, 2000) are the affective qualities that ease the supervisory practices. In literature, there were substantial number of studies which have analysed the role of supervisory practices on thesis completion and students' performance (Hadi, & Muhammad, 2019; Azman, Nor, & Aghwela, 2014; Kunle, 2021; Habibah, 2016).

Numerous studies have acknowledged the complex web of factors affecting programme completion which are attributed to interpersonal, environmental, social and cognitive factors (Dziuban et al., 2013). Carroll, Ng and Birch (2009) highlighted three critical factors for the non-completion of programme by Postgraduate students. These factors are situational factors, particularly related to students' life; dispositional factors which are related to students' beliefs, attitudes, values, and institutional factors which are related to the policies, procedure and structure within the university. This research focused on three major factors which are; student, supervisor and institution.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Much has been the concern on the importance of the relationship between the graduate student and his/her adviser (McCulloch et al., 2016). Also, student progress is affected by the financial and emotional support received by the student, the different aspects of the student-adviser relationship, and the departmental ecology. Researches were also most likely to focus on the factors involved in the graduate supervision

process, such as supervisor's understanding, care, proximity and knowledge of the research field and his or her availability for consultation (Egan et al., 2009; Guerin et al., 2015).

According to Alexander & Hermann, (2015), aspects related to successful completion of postgraduate degree within the universities' time limits are; high student motivation, appropriate supervision, clearly defined research field, and enough time for full-time study. The most commonly mentioned reasons for non-completion of postgraduate degree were acceptance of employment prior to completion, inadequate supervision, financial constraints, poorly-conceptualized projects, lack of motivation, and lack of ability. Other factors include the type of financial support, teaching assistantships, training to conduct independent research, departmental orientation and advising, attitudes towards students, adviser-student relationship and changing advisers as the main characteristics that affect postgraduate degree completion.

In a study by Wadesango et al. (2011) exploring postgraduate student's experiences in two South African Universities, the researchers found that 75% of the respondents were unhappy with the feedback from their supervisors. This was also the case in the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst and British Council Rport (DAAD/BC, 2018) in which students complained that supervisors took too long with their work without giving them feedback. The situation is exacerbated by the fact that in some universities, there exist no mechanism to deal with such delays and where they exist, they are not enforced. In the same study however, supervisors raised the concern that students did not keep in touch with them after completing their course work (Wadesango et al., 2011).

According to DAAD/BC (2018), only 40% of lecturers in Kenya have PhD qualifications. This mirrors another study by Clarks and Ausukuya (2013) in Nigeria who found out that only 43% of Lecturers had a PhD qualification. It shows that this is not just a Kenyan situation but a reflection of the African continent's wide reality. One of the major challenges of doctoral education in Africa is that African universities do not have a critical mass of experts able to supervise doctoral theses in all areas of scholarship and that some supervisors do not not have sufficient knowledge of the students' research topic and therefore not able to provide constructive guidance to the student (Gunnarsson, Grethe & Annika, 2013).

According to Ali et al., (2016), the issue of back-and-forth encounters between supervisors and supervisees is another challenge which may prolong the time taken by students to complete their work. This impedes the progress of students especially where the supervisors give unclear and sometimes conflicting feedback which often derails or takes the student back to matters that should have been handled before. The other challenge is poor interpersonal relations between supervisors and their students where some students do not get along with their supervisors because of either personality or ideological differences.

Caldwell et al. (2012) conducted a study to investigate supervisory needs among doctoral students in a university teaching hospital setting. The study involved 10 focus groups and used the Delphi method to carry out the research. The study found that there were differences in expectations between students and supervisors (with students wanting support for their career plans, training in research skills and increasing autonomy and responsibility), supervisor access, quality and frequency of meetings, lack of training in writing and dealing with conflicts.

According to Azure (2016), supervisors should be friendly, approachable and flexible; knowledgeable and resourceful; and encourage students to work and plan independently. When supervisors are not aware or are unavailable to meet students' expectations and to understand their situations, interpersonal relationships are exacerbated. There can be tensions in the relationship between students and their supervisors based on the guidance needed versus prescription approaches perceived by students, and finding a suitable balance is not always straightforward. Moreover, in some cases, students have suspected biases and prejudices of supervisors which negatively affect the direction of students' work.

Wadesango et al. (2011) investigated 40 postgraduate students from 2 South African Universities on their experiences with research supervisors. The findings indicated that 75% of the respondents were dissatisfied with their supervisors' feedback. Respondents indicated insufficient knowledge of the relevant field, change of supervisors due to transfer to other institutions, lack of supervisory support and supervisor's other work load. Tensions and conflicting perspectives within the supervisory panel, selfishness and disrespectfulness as well as lack of knowledge and expertise in the field of study were identified as challenges facing some of the post graduate students in this study.

Hudson, (2014) and Gunnarsson, Grethe and Annika, (2013) documented the frustrations postgraduate students experience when they have more than one supervisor, both giving conflicting feedback or who do not agree with each other's comments, leaving the student caught in between not knowing which advice to take between the two.

Mudhovozi et al. (2013) explored mentors' views of supervising postgraduate students undertaking research at an institution in Zimbabwe where some mentors reported that they gave support to their mentees. The support included equipping the mentees with research skills, language support, editorial knowledge, providing literature and teamwork. Mentees were however reported to have some weakness; the mentees were viewed as not proactive, lacked knowledge, lacked English expressive skills, poorly referenced their work, submitted unedited work and used outdated sources. In addition, they struggled to access recent relevant and literature, their work was below postgraduate level and they failed to complete their projects in time.

According to Ali, Watson & Dhingra (2016), who examined 31 students and 77 supervisors, supervisions factors that determine successful supervision included: leadership which is the ability to lead the supervision process, knowledge of a research topic and ability to support students in acquiring appropriate research skills.

Institutional factors according to Yousefi, Bazrafkan & Yaman, (2015) include; work overload for the graduate faculty members who are meant to supervise the doctoral students, poor staff developments, lack of resources, weak structure of thesis supervision, ambiguity in expertise criteria in supervision, ineffective evaluation. Other institutional issues include: lack of scientific and research programmes, lack of specific research line, head of department's influence, student's tendency to choose supervisor with specific position, faculties' disagreement in cooperating with supervisor from out of the university, Unclear responsibility for thesis subject selection, limit for the number of thesis, inappropriate criteria for being a supervisor, undefined tasks for supervisors, lack of supervision bylaws for evaluating supervisors and holding several executive posts by supervisors (Ghadirian et al., 2014).

Non-enforcement of supervisory regulations and policies by the University authorities is another institutional challenge that has come up in literature. DAAD/BC's (2018), observed that most universities had policies and regulations on supervision of postgraduate students including requirements of number of meetings between students and their supervisors, lead time when feedback is expected from the supervisor once a student hands in their work, schedules and milestones on submitting progress report to the graduate school were all rarely enforced. In some universities, there is no code of ethics to guide the supervision process outlining the respective rights and responsibilities of the supervisors and the students.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a mixed method design, specifically the descriptive study design. The mixed method analysis comprised of combining both qualitative and quantitative data for meaningful interpretation (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, primarily

frequencies, means, and standard deviations. A qualitative descriptive methodology was chosen for its clear potential for mixed method triangulation with quantitative data. A qualitative descriptive methodology is best when seeking to provide accurate description and interpretation of data (Speziale & Carpenter, 2007).

This study was conducted among post graduate students of University of Kabianga. The target population was ——— and a sample size of 100 (20%) respondents was used. The rationale for the choice of study subjects is that effective supervision is a two-way affair, requiring the cooperation of both the supervisor and the student (Steehuis & Bruijn, 2009). It was therefore necessary in this study to get the perspectives of students in order to bring out their experiences so as to come up with remedies for addressing the challenges.

The research instrument for the study was developed and validated by the researchers. The items were selected from the various available survey instruments and the items were validated by three experts. In this study, the items for the variables were adapted from the Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (Marsh, Rowe & Martin, 2002), Postgraduate Supervisee and Postgraduate Supervisors' Questionnaires (Sidhu et al, 2013) and postgraduate motivation questionnaire (Igun, 2010). The questionnaire used in the present study had two sections, A and B. The responses were collected using a self- administered questionnaire which used a five-point Likert scale, with the responses ranging from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1). To ensure the content and construct validity, the questionnaires were pre-tested on five postgraduate students studying at public and private universities. The questionnaire was improved based on their feedback. The study distributed 100 survey questionnaires and 64 participants returned the survey this translates to a response rate of 64.0% in the data collection. Data cleaning procedures as suggested by Field (2013) were followed to screen the data prior to data analysis.

STUDY FINDINGS

The study findings are explained herein based on the study variables.

Table 1.1 Students related factors

Students related factors and completion of graduate studies	1 (SD)	2 (D)	3 (N)	4 (A)	5(SA)	Mean	Std. Deviation
Lack of Motivation	9 (14.1%)	17 (26.6%)	9 (14.1%)	17 (26.6%)	12 (18.8%)	3.2187	1.30285
Job related assignment and duties	1 (1.6%)	12 (18.8%)	3 (4.7%)	26 (40.6%)	22 (34.4%)	4.0156	.93422
Poor language skills	22 (34.4%)	19 (29.7%)	0 (0.0%)	16 (25.0%)	7 (10.9%)	2.1250	1.01575
Post-marriage domestic responsibilities	9 (14.1%)	9 (14.1%)	7 (10.9%)	22 (34.4%)	17 (26.6%)	3.1406	1.21977
Financial constraints	11 (17.2%)	5 (7.8%)	0 (0.0%)	19 (29.7%)	29 (45.5%)	4.1250	.96773
Students' own commitment	16 (25.0%)	10 (15.6%)	6 (9.4%)	16 (25.0%)	16 (25.0%)	3.4063	1.28135
Lack of preparation	9 (14.1%)	16 (25.0%)	7 (10.9%)	13 (20.3%)	19 (29.7%)	2.9844	1.25347
The academic and research environment	7 (10.9%)	11 (17.2%)	4 (6.3%)	20 (31.3%)	22 (34.4%)	3.2656	1.07263

Inability to use modern toolsof communication imposing of topics on supervision	11 (17.2%)	13 (20.3%)	11 (17.2%)	14 (21.9%)	15 (23.4%)	3.0937	1.42226
Poor guidance in topic selection	12 (18.8%)	13 (20.3%)	10 (15.6%)	16 (25.0%)	13 (20.3%)	3.1406	1.37860

Source: Research Data (2022).

Majority of the respondents who were 17 (26.6%) agreed as well as 12 (18.8%) respondents who strongly agreed that they lack motivation to complete their postgraduate studies. The respondents who were 17 (26.6%) disagreed as well as 9(14.1%) respondents who strongly disagreed that they lack motivation to complete their postgraduate studies while 9 (14.1% respondent were undecided. Job related assignment and duties was the reason why most of the postgraduate students have not completed their courses as revealed by majority of the respondents who were 26 (40.6%) who agreed together with 22 (34.4%) respondents who strongly agree. Respondents who were 12 (18.8%) disagreed as well as 1 (1.6%) respondents who strongly disagreed that job related assignment and duties was the reason they have completed their postgraduate studies while 3 (4.7%) respondents were undecided

Poor language skills was not the reason for not completed postgraduate studies on time by 22 (34.4%) respondents who strongly disagreed as well as 19 (29.7%) respondents who disagreed. The respondents who were 16 (25.0%) agreed as well as 7 (10.9%) respondents who strongly agreed that poor language skills are the reason they have not completed their postgraduate studies on time. Majority of the respondents who were 22 (34.4%) agreed as well as 17 (26.6%) respondent who strongly agreed that post-marriage domestic responsibilities have caused them not complete their postgraduate studies on time. Respondents who were 9 (14.1%) strongly disagreed and the same number disagreed that post-marriage domestic responsibilities have caused them not complete their postgraduate studies on time. Respondents who were 7 (10.9%) were undecided.

Financial constraints is the reason why majority of the respondents who were 29 (45.5%) who strongly agreed as well as 19 (29.7%) who agreed that it has caused them not to complete their studies on time. Respondents who were 11 (17.2%) who strongly disagreed as well as 5 (7.8%) who disagreed that financial constraints have made them not complete their studies on time. Respondents who were 16 (25.0%) agreed as well as the same the number strongly agreed that students' own commitment is the reason they have not completed their postgraduate studies. Respondents who were 16 (25.5%) strongly disagreed as well as 10 (15.6%) who disagreed that students' own commitment is the reason they have not completed their postgraduate studies while 6 (9.4%) respondents were undecided. Lack of preparation has made majority of postgraduate students not to complete their studies on time. This is according to majority of respondents who were 19 (29.7%) who strongly agreed as well as 13 (20.3%) respondents who agreed. Respondents who were 16 (25.0%) who disagreed as well as 9 (14.1%) who strongly disagreed that lack of preparation is not the reason they have not completed their studies. Respondents who were 7 (10.9%) were undecided.

Majority of the respondents who were 22 (34.4%) strongly agree as well as 20 (31.3%) agreed that academic and research environment is the reason they have not completed their postgraduate studies. Respondents who were 11 (17.2%) disagreed as well as 7 (10.9%) who strongly disagreed that academic and research environment is the reason they have not completed their postgraduate studies. Respondents who were 4 (6.3%) were undecided. Respondents who were 15 (23.4%) strongly agreed as well as 14 (21.9%) respondents who agreed that their inability to use modern tools of communication is the reason they did not complete their postgraduate studies on time. Respondents who were 13 (20.3%) disagreed as well as 11 (17.2%) respondents who strongly agreed that their inability to use modern tools of communication is the reason they did not complete their postgraduate studies on time. Respondents who were 11 (17.2%) were

undecided.

Poor guidance in topic selection is the reason why majority of postgraduate students do not complete their studies on time. This is as per majority of respondents who were 16 (26.0%) who agreed as well as 13 (20.3%) of the respondents who strongly agreed. Respondents who were 13 (20.3%) disagreed as well as 12 (18.8%) of respondents who strongly disagreed that poor guidance in topic selection is the reason why majority of postgraduate students do not complete their studies on time. Respondents who were 10 (15.6%) who were undecided.

From the findings postgraduate students fails to complete their courses on time due to; financial constraints (Mean = 4.125, SD = 0.968), job related assignment and duties (Mean = 4.016, SD = 0.934), students' own commitment (Mean = 3.406, SD = 1.281), academic and research environment (Mean = 3.266, SD = 1.072), lack of motivation (Mean = 3.219, SD = 1.303), post-marriage domestic responsibilities (Mean = 3.140, SD = 1.219), poor guidance in topic selection (Mean = 3.140, SD = 1.378), inability to use modern tools of communication (Mean = 3.094, SD = 1.422), lack of preparation (Mean = 2.984, SD = 1.253) and poor language skills (Mean = 2.125, SD = 1.016) least affect postgraduate students completion of their studies on time.

Table 1.2 Supervisors related factors

Supervisors related factors and completion of graduate studies	1 (SD)	2 (D)	3 (N)	4 (A)	5(SA)	Mean	Std. Deviation
Poor knowledge of topic undertaken by students	13 (20.3%)	13 (20.3%)	11 (17.2%)	13 (20.3%)	14 (21.9%)	3.0938	1.41105
Frequent changes of the research topics	13 (20.3%)	13 (20.3%)	9 (14.1%)	19 (29.7%)	10 (15.6%)	3.1250	1.30323
Failure to keep to time schedule for discussion or research work	11 (17.2%)	7 (10.9%)	5 (7.8%)	26 (40.6%)	15 (23.4%)	3.4844	1.14076
Poor interpersonal relationship with the supervisors	19 (29.7%)	11 (17.2%)	5 (7.8%)	16 (25.0%)	13 (20.3%)	2.9219	1.49395
Poor feedback on work progress	9 (14.1%)	14 (21.9%)	6 (9.4%)	20 (31.3%)	15 (23.4%)	3.4531	1.25900
Failure to provide additional information to enhance the research completion	10 (15.6%)	12 (18.8%)	10 (15.6%)	16 (25.0%)	16 (25.0%)	3.2812	1.40824
Improper guideline on written works	13 (20.3%)	12 (18.8%)	7 (10.9%)	14 (21.9%)	18 (28.1%)	3.1719	1.26685
Busy schedule of the supervisors	8 (12.5%)	12 (18.8%)	6 (9.4%)	19 (29.7%)	19 (29.7%)	3.5469	1.34436
Lack of experience in supervision	18 (28.1%)	18 (28.1%)	4 (6.3%)	17 (26.6%)	7 (10.9%)	2.4219	1.17925
Lack of knowledge in the relevant field/insufficient research skills	16 (25.0%)	16 (25.0%)	5 (7.8%)	15 (23.4%)	12 (18.8%)	2.5938	1.26890

Less positive attitude towards quality research work	11 (17.2%)	16 (25.0%)	9 (14.1%)	13 (20.3%)	15 (23.4%)	2.9219	1.32503
Inability to use modern tools of communication	11 (17.2%)	14 (21.9%)	6 (9.4%)	25 (28.1%)	8 (12.5%)	3.1094	1.12852
Supervisor-student rapport	6 (9.4%)	17 (26.6%)	5 (7.8%)	19 (29.7%)	17 (26.6%)	3.5781	1.20587
Inaccessibility when needed	9 (14.1%)	13 (20.3%)	6 (9.4%)	15 (23.4%)	21 (32.8%)	3.5156	1.40286
Delay in reading submitted works	9 (14.1%)	14 (21.9%)	6 (9.4%)	14 (21.9%)	21 (32.8%)	3.5469	1.33250
Failure to keep to time schedule for discussion of research work	16 (25.0%)	15 (23.4%)	3 (4.7%)	16 (25.0%)	14 (21.9%)	3.3438	1.21131
Failure to provide additional information to enhance the research completion	10 (15.6%)	16 (25.0%)	9 (14.1%)	15 (23.4%)	14 (21.9%)	3.2344	1.34214

Source: Research Data (2022)

Respondents who were 14 (21.9%) strongly agree as well as 13 (20.3%) respondents who agreed that poor knowledge of topic undertaken by student has been the reason most of them have not completed their course. Respondents who were 13 (20.3%) disagreed as well as the same number strongly disagreeing that poor knowledge of topic undertaken by student has been the reason most of them have not completed their course. Respondents who were 11 (17.2%) were undecided. Frequent changes of the research topics is the reason 19 (29.7%) of the respondents as well as 10 (15.6%) respondents who agreed as well as strongly agreed as the reason they have not completed their studies. Respondents who were 13 (20.3%) strongly disagreed as well as the same number disagreeing that frequent changes of the research topics is reason they have delayed in completing their studies. Respondents who were undecided were 9 (14.1%).

Majority of the respondents who were 26 (40.6%) agreed as well as 15 (23.4%) strongly agreed that failure to keep to time schedule for discussion or research work by the supervisor is the reason they have delayed in completing their studies. Respondents who were 11 (17.2%) strongly disagreed as well as 7 (10.9%) of the respondents who disagreed that failure to keep to time schedule for discussion or research work by the supervisor is the reason they have delayed in completing their studies. Undecided respondents were 5 (7.8%). Respondents who were 19 (29.7%) strongly disagreed as well as 11 (17.2%) respondents disagreed that poor interpersonal relationship with the supervisors has been the reason they have not completed their studies. Respondents who were 16 (25.0%) agreed as well as 13 (20.3%) strongly agreed that poor interpersonal relationship with the supervisors has been the reason they have not completed their studies while 5 (7.8%) of the respondents were undecided.

Majority of respondents who were 20 (31.3%) agreed as well as 15 (23.4%) strongly agreed that poor feedback on work progress by the supervisor has delayed their completion of studies. Respondents who were 14 (21.9%) disagreed as well as 9 (14.1%) respondents who strongly disagreed that poor feedback on work progress by the supervisor has delayed their completion of studies. Respondents who were 6 (9.4%) were undecided. Failure to provide additional information to enhance the research completion by the supervisor is the reason 16 (25.0%) respondents who agreed as well as the same number strongly agreeing as the reason they have not completed their courses. Respondents who were 12 (18.8%) disagreed as well as 10 (15.6%) strongly disagreed that failure to provide additional information to enhance the research completion by the supervisor is the reason they have not completed their studies. Undecided respondents

were 10 (15.6%).

Respondents who were 18 (28.1%) strongly agreed as well as 14 (21.9%) respondents who agreed that improper guideline on written works by the supervisor is the reason they have not completed their studies. Respondents who were 12 (18.8%) disagreed as well as 10 (15.6%) strongly disagreed that that improper guideline on written works by the supervisor is the reason they have not completed their studies. Respondents who were undecided were 7 (10.9%). Busy schedule of the supervisors was the reason 19 (29.7%) of the respondents who agreed and the same number strongly agreeing that it is the reason they have not completed their studies. Respondents who were 12 (18.8%) disagreed as well as 8 (12.5%) strongly disagreed that busy schedule of the supervisors was the reason they have not completed their studies. Respondents who were 6 (9.4%) were undecided. Lack of experience in supervision was not the reason why 36 (56.2%) respondents have not completed their postgraduate studies. The respondents who were 17 (26.6%) agreed as well as 7 (10.9%) strongly agreeing that lack of experience in supervision was the reason they have not completed their postgraduate studies. Respondents who were 4 (6.3%) were undecided.

Respondents who were 12 (18.8%) strongly agreed and 15 (23.4%) agreed that lack of knowledge in the relevant field/insufficient research skills by supervisors was the reason for delay in completion of their studies. There were 16 (25%) respondents who disagreed as well as 16 (25%) who strongly disagreed and 5 (7.8%) were undecided that lack of knowledge in the relevant field/insufficient research skills by supervisors is the reason they have not completed their studies. Less positive attitude towards quality research work by supervisors was the reason why 15 (23.4%) and 13 (20.3%) respondents who agreed and agreed respectively delayed their studies completion. There were 16 (25 %) who disagreed and 11 (17.2% who strongly disagreed while 9 (14.1% were undecided. Inability to use modern tools of communication by supervisors was a reason why 8 (12.5%) respondents who strongly agreed and 25 (28.1%) who agreed delayed to complete their studies. There were 11 (17.2%) and 14 (21.9%) who strongly disagreed and agreed respectively while 6 (9.4%) were undecided. Inaccessibility of supervisors when needed was a reason why 21 (32.8%) respondents who strongly agreed and 15 (23.4%) agreed delayed in completing their studies. There were 9 (14.1%) and 13 (20.3%) who strongly disagreed and disagreed respectively. Those who were undecided were 6 (9.4%). Delay in reading submitted works by supervisors made some students not to complete their studies for 21 (32.8%) strongly agreed while 14 (21.9%) agreed. There were 6 (9.4%) who were undecided while 9 (14.1%) strongly disagreed and 14 (21.9%) disagreed. Failure of supervisors to provide additional information to enhance the research completion supervisors was the reason for delayed completion for 14 (21.9%)

Supervisor-student rapport was among the causes of delayed completion of graduate studies because 17 (26.6%) respondents strongly agreed and 19 (29.7%) agreed. Those who strongly disagreed were 6 (9.4%) and 17 (26.6%) disagreed. The undecided were 5 (7.8%). Failure to keep to time schedule for discussion of research work by supervisors contributed to delays in completion for 14 (21.9%) respondents strongly agreed and 16 (25%) agreed. Those who strongly disagreed were 16 (25%) while 15 (23.4%) disagreed. Those who were undecided were 3(4.7%). Failure to provide additional information to enhance the research completion was among the reasons for delayed completion because 14 (21.9%) respondents strongly agreed and 15 (23.4%) agreed. Those who strongly disagreed were 10 (15.6%) and 16 (25%) disagreed. The undecided were 9 (14.1%).

The findings in Table 1.2 reveals that supervisors related reasons which have delayed completion of course by postgraduate students were; busy schedule of the supervisors (Mean = 3.547, SD = 1.344); failure to keep to time schedule for discussion or research work (Mean = 3.484, SD = 1.141); poor feedback on work progress (Mean = 3.453, SD = 1.259); failure to provide additional information to enhance the research completion (Mean = 3.281, SD = 1.408); frequent changes of the research topics (Mean = 3.125, SD = 1.303); improper guideline on written works (Mean = 3.171, SD = 1.267); poor knowledge of topic

undertaken by students (Mean = 3.094, SD = 1.411); poor interpersonal relationship with the supervisors (Mean = 2.922, SD = 1.494) and lack of experience in supervision (Mean = 2.422, SD = 1.179) was the least reason for students to complete their studies.

Table 1.3 Institutional Factors

Institutional Factors	1 (SD)	2 (D)	3 (N)	4 (A)	5(SA)	Mean	Std. Deviation
Academic research environment	9 (14.1%)	15 (23.4%)	6 (9.4%)	17 (26.6%)	17 (26.6%)	3.4219	1.35465
Procedural delay	11 (17.2%)	15 (23.4%)	4 (6.3%)	18 (28.1%)	16 (25.0%)	3.4844	1.22140
Non-alignment of the functioning of different administrative bodies	10 (15.6%)	14 (21.9%)	7 (10.9%)	22 (34.4%)	11 (17.2%)	3.3125	1.24563
Irrelevant rules and regulations in thesis submissions process	15 (23.4%)	14 (21.9%)	11 (17.2%)	13 (20.3%)	11 (17.2%)	2.9688	1.35657
Lack of research infrastructure	10 (15.6%)	16 (25.0%)	9 (14.1%)	14 (21.9%)	15 (23.4%)	3.2500	1.35693
Poor research culture	14 (21.9%)	12 (18.8%)	9 (14.1%)	15 (23.4%)	12 (18.8%)	3.0156	1.41973

Source: Research Data (2022)

Table 1.3 reveals that respondents who were 17 (26.6%) agreed as well as the same number strongly agreed that academic research environment is the reason they do not complete their studies on time. Respondents who were 15 (23.4%) disagreed as well as 9 (14.1%) respondents strongly disagreed that academic research environment is the reason they do not complete their studies on time. Respondents who were 6 (9.4%) were undecided. Procedural delay is the reason which according to majority of respondents 18 (28.1%) who agreed as well as 16 (25.0%) who strongly agreed as the reason for them not to complete their studies on time. Respondents who were 15 (23.4%) disagreed as well as 11 (17.2%) respondents who strongly disagreed that procedural delay is the reason they did not complete their studies on time. Undecided respondents were 4 (6.3%)

Respondents who were 22 (34.4%) agreed as well as 11 (17.2%) respondents who strongly greed that non-alignment of the functioning of different administrative bodies is the reason they have not completed their studies on time. Respondents who were 14 (21.9%) who disagreed as well as 10 (15.6%) respondents who strongly disagreed that non-alignment of the functioning of different administrative bodies is the reason they have not completed their studies on time. Respondents who were 7 (10.9%) were undecided.

According to the analysis 15 (23.4%) respondents strongly disagreed and 14 (21.9%) disagreed that irrelevant rules and regulations in thesis submissions process is the reason they did not complete their studies on time. Respondents who were 13 (20.3%) agreed as well as 11 (17.2%) who strongly agreed that irrelevant rules and regulations in thesis submissions process is the reason they did not complete their studies on time. Undecided respondents were 11 (17.2%). Lack of research infrastructure according to 15 (23.4%) who strongly agreed as well as 14 (21.9%) respondents who agreed is the reason they did not complete their studies on time. Respondents who were 16 (25.0%) disagreed as well as 10 (15.6%) respondents who strongly disagreed that it is the reason they did not complete their studies on time.

Respondents 9 (14.1%) were undecided. Respondents who were 15 (23.4%) agreed as well as 12 (18.8%) respondents who strongly agreed that poor research culture is the reason they do not complete their studies on time. Respondents who were 14 (21.9%) strongly disagreed as well as 12 (18.8%) respondents who disagreed that poor research culture is the reason they do not complete their studies on time. Undecided respondents were 9 (14.1%).

As per the findings in Table 1.3, the institutional reasons which cause delay in completion of academic programme are; procedural delay (Mean = 3.484, SD = 1.221); academic research environment (Mean = 3.422, SD = 1.354); non-alignment of the functioning of different administrative bodies (Mean = 3.313, SD = 1.245); lack of research infrastructure (Mean = 3.250, SD = 1.357); poor research culture (Mean = 3.016, SD = 1.419) and irrelevant rules and regulations in thesis submissions process (Mean = 2.969, SD = 1.356) is the least reason why postgraduate students don't complete their studies on time.

Table 1.4 Correlations

		supervisee	supervisor	institutional
Supervisee	Pearson Correlation	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)			
	N	64		
supervisor	Pearson Correlation	.515**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		
	N	64	64	
institutional	Pearson Correlation	.558**	.686**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	64	64	64
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Source: Research Data (2022)

The results in Table 1.4 indicate a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.515 which shows that supervisor characteristics have a moderate correlation with postgraduate completion time p (0.000). The Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.558 gives an indication that institutional characteristics have a moderate correlation with postgraduate completion time p (0.000). This implies that there was a moderate relationship between supervisor and postgraduate completion time and that institutional factors moderately affect postgraduate completion time.

Table 1.5 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.727[a]	.528	.512	.60381
a. Predictors: (Constant), supervisee, supervisor institutional				

Source: Research Data (2022)

Table 1.5 revealed that postgraduate studies factors had positive significant relationship with postgraduate completion time (R=0.727). The results showed that 52.8% of postgraduate completion time is explained by

postgraduate factors (R Square = 0.528). Hence, other factors not in the study attributed to 47.2% variation of postgraduate factors.

Table 1.6 ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	24.867	2	12.434	34.103	.000[b]
	Residual	22.240	61	.365		
	Total	47.107	63			
a. Dependent Variable: postgraduate completion time.						
b. Predictors: (Constant), supervisee, supervisor, institutional						

Source: Research Data (2022)

Table 1.6 on ANOVA revealed that there existed significant relationship between postgraduate factors and postgraduate completion time ($F_{(2, 61)}$ = 34.103, p <0.05). The findings showed that the significance value is 0.000 which is below 0.05. This implies that there is a statistically significant relationship between postgraduate factors and postgraduate completion time.

Table 1.7 Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.233	.402		.581	.564
	supervisor	.572	.108	.543	5.292	.000
	supervisee	.368	.136	.278	2.709	.009
a. Dependent Variable: institutional						

Source: Research Data (2022)

As presented on Table 1.7, it was established that there exists a significant positive relationship between supervisor factors and postgraduate completion time β = 0.572. The results were statistically significant since p (0.000) which was less than 0.05. The beta coefficient of 0.572 means that when supervisor factors increases by an additional unit, postgraduate completion time increases by 0.572.

There exist a positive relationship between supervisee factors and postgraduate completion time β = 0.368. The results were statistically insignificant since p (0.009) which was less than 0.05. The beta coefficient of 0.368 means that when supervisee factors increases by an additional unit, postgraduate completion time increases by 0.368

CONCLUSION

Postgraduate students fail to complete their courses on time due to; financial constraints, job related assignment and duties, students' own commitment, academic and research environment, lack of motivation, post-marriage domestic responsibilities, poor guidance in topic selection, inability to use modern tools of communication imposing of topics on supervision, lack of preparation and poor language skills least affect postgraduate students completion of their studies on time. The supervisors related reasons which delay completion of course by postgraduate students were; busy schedule of the supervisors; failure to keep to

time schedule for discussion or research work; poor feedback on work progress; failure to provide additional information to enhance the research completion; frequent changes of the research topics; improper guideline on written works; poor knowledge of topic undertaken by students; poor interpersonal relationship with the supervisors and lack of experience in supervision was the least reason for students to complete their studies. Institutional reasons which cause delay in completion of academic programme are; procedural delay; academic research environment; non-alignment of the functioning of different administrative bodies; lack of research infrastructure; poor research culture and irrelevant rules and regulations in thesis submissions process is the least reason why postgraduate students don't complete their studies on time.

REFERENCES

1. Abiddin, N. Z., Ismail, A., & Ismail, A. (2011). Effective supervisory approach in enhancing postgraduate research studies. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(2), 206-217.
2. Yousefi, A., Bazrafkan, L., & Yaman, N. (2015). A qualitative inquiry into the challenges and complexities of research supervision: viewpoints of postgraduate students and faculty members. *J Adv Med Educ Prof*. 3(3), 91–98 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4530006/.
3. Ali, P. A., Watson, R., & Dhingra, K. (2016). Postgraduate research students' and their supervisors' attitudes towards supervision. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 11, 227-241. Retrieved from http://www.informingscience.org/Publications/3541. Accessed on 3rd April 2023.
4. Azman, H., Nor, N. F. M., & Aghwela, H. O. M. (2014). Investigating supervisory feedback practices and their impact on international research student's thesis development: A case study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 152-159.
5. Azure, J. A. (2016). Students' perspective of effective supervision of graduate programmes in Ghana. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 4(2), 163-169. doi:10.12691/education-4-2-4
6. Brown, R. D., & Krager, L. (1985). Ethical issues in graduate education: Faculty and student responsibilities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 56(4), 403-418.
7. Caldwell, P. H., Oldmeadow W., & Jones, C. A. (2012). Supervisory needs of research doctoral students in a university teaching hospital setting. *Journal of Pediatrics and Child Health*. 48(10), 907-912. doi: 10.1111/j.1440-1754.2012.02522.x. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22897150.
8. Carroll, D., Ng, E., & Birch, D. (2009). Retention and progression of postgraduate business students: An Australian perspective. Open Learning: *The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning*, 24(3), 197-209.
9. Clark, N. & Ausukuya, C. (2013). An overview of education in Nigeria. *World Education News and Reviews*. Available online at: http://wenr.wes.org/2013/07/an-overviewof-education-in-nigeria.
10. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
11. Cryer, P. (2006). *The research student's guide to success*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
12. Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst and British Council Rport (DAAD/BC, 2018). Building PhD Capacity in Sub-Saharan Africa. *International Higher Education*. https://www2.daad.de/medien/der-daad/analysen-studien/building_phd_capacity_in_sub-saharan_africa.pdf
13. Dziuban, C., Moskal, P., Kramer, L., & Thompson, J. (2013). Student satisfaction with online learning in the presence of ambivalence: Looking for the will-o'-the-wisp. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 17, 1-8.
14. Egan, R., Stockley, D. Brouwer, B., Tripp, D., & Stechyson, N. (2009). Relationships between area of academic concentration, supervisory style, student needs and best practices. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34 (3), 337-345.
15. Eyangu, S., Bagire, V., & Kibrai, M. (2014). An examination of the completion rate of masters programs at Makerere University Business School. *Creative Education*, 5(22), 1913.
16. Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. SAGE.
17. Ghadirian, L., Sayarifard, A., Majdzadeh, R., Rajabi, F., & Yunesian, M. (2014). Challenges for

Better thesis supervision. *Medical Journal of the Islamic Republic of Iran*. 28(32), https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4154287/.

18. Girves, J. E., & Wemmerus, V. (1988). Developing models of graduate student degree progress. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 59(2), 163-189.

19. Guerin, C., Kerrer, H., & Green, I. (2015). Supervision pedagogies: narrtatives from the field. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 20 (1), 107-118

20. Gunnarsson, G., Grethe J. & Annika B. (2013). The experience of disagreement between students and supervisors in PhD education: A qualitative study. *BMC Medical Education*, 134 (13), 1-8.

21. Habibah, A. (2016). Personal Realities and the Apprenticeship of Supervising: My Tortouos Journey as a Supervisor. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 12(2).

22. Hadi, N. U., & Muhammad, B. (2019). Factors Influencing Postgraduate Students' Performance: A high order top-down structural equation modelling approach. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 19(2).

23. Haksever, A. M., & Manisali, E. (2000). Assessing supervision requirements of PhD students: The case of construction management and engineering in the UK. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 25(1), 19-32.

24. Hoon, T. S., Narayanan, G., Sidhu, G. K., Choo, L. P., Fook, C. Y., & Salleh, N. N. B. M. (2019). Students' perceptions toward postgraduate study: A Preliminary Investigation. *International Journal of Education*, 4(30), 123-138.

25. Hudson, P. (2014). Feedback consistencies and inconsistencies: Eight mentors' observations on one preservice teacher's lesson. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 37 (1) 63-73, 10.1080/02619768.2013.801075.

26. Igun, S. E. (2010). Difficulties and motivation of postgraduate students in selected Nigerian universities. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal), Paper, 369.

27. Kunle, O. (2021). Postgraduate Supervision: A Heuristic Approach to Learning, Unlearning, and Relearning. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 17 (4).

28. Marsh, H. W., Rowe, K. J., & Martin, A. (2002). PhD students' evaluations of research supervision: issues, complexities, and challenges in a nationwide Australian experiment in benchmarking universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(3), 313-348.

29. Mbogo, R. W. (2016). Antecedent Factors Affecting Academic Performance of Graduate Students at the Nairobi Evangelical Graduate School of Theology. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(18), 128-141.

30. McCulloch, A., Kumar, V., van Schalkwyk, S., & Wisker, G. (2016). Excellence in doctoral supervision: an examination of authoritative sources across four countries in search of performance in higher than competence. *Quality in Higher Education*. 22 (1), 64-77

31. Mhunpiew, N. (2013). A Supervisor's Roles for Successful Thesis and Dissertation. *Online Submission*, 3(2), 119-122

32. Mudhovozi, P., Manganye, L., & Mashamba, T. (2013). Mentors' Views of Supervising Post-graduate Students Undertaking Research at an Institution in Zimbabwe. Kamla-Raj 2013 *J Soc Sci*, 37(3), 293-300. http://www.krepublishers.com/02-Journals/JSS/JSS-37-0-000-13-Web/JSS-37-3-000-13-Abst-PDF/JSS-37-3-293-13-1456-Mudhovozi-P/JSS-37-3-293-13-1456-Mudhovozi-P-Tx[9].pmd.pdf.

33. Phillips, E. M., & Pugh, D. S. (2000). How to get a PhD: A handbook for students and their supervisors. *Open University Press*.

34. Rubin B., Fernandes R., & Avgerinou M. D. (2013). The effects of technology on the community of inquiry and satisfaction with online courses. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 17, 48–57. DOI: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2012.09.006.

35. Russell, A. (1996). *Postgraduate research: student and supervisor views*. The Flinders University of South Australia.

36. Siamian, H., Mahmoudi, R., Habibi, F., Latifi, M., & Zare-Gavgani, V. (2016). Students' attitudes towards research at Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences in 2015. *Materia socio-medica*, 28(6), 468 – 472. DOI: 10.5455/msm.2016.28.

37. Sidhu G. K., Lim P. C., & Chan Y. F. (2017). Developing a framework for postgraduate supervision," in Empowering 21st Century Learners Through Holistic and Enterprising Learning, *Springer*, 255–267.

38. Sidhu, G. K., Kaur, S., Fook, C. Y., & Yunus, F. W. (2013). Postgraduate supervision: Exploring Malaysian students' experiences. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 90, 133-141.

39. Speziale, H. J. & Carpenter, D. R. (2007). *Qualitative research in nursing advancing the humanistic imperative*. 4th Edition. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Williams and Wilkins.

40. Steehuis, H. J. & Bruijn, E. J. (2009). PhD students: supervision and success. Conference Paper Orlando, Florida U.S.A. *Research Gate*.

41. Tinto, V. (2006). Research and practice of student retention: What next?. *Journal of College Student Retention*: Research, Theory & Practice, 8(1), 1-19.

42. Vasugi S., and Che Hassan, Norlizah (2019) Depression, anxiety and stress among postgraduate students in Faculty of Education of a public university in Malaysia. *Malaysian Journal of Medicine and Health Sciences*, 15 (SUPP1). pp. 90-95. ISSN 1675-8544; ESSN: 2636-9346

43. Wadesango, N., Machingambi, S., & Raj, Kamla. (2011). Post Graduate Students' Experiences with Research Supervisors. Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology, 2(1), 31-37. http://www.krepublishers.com/02-Journals/JSSA/JSSA-02-0-000-11-Web/JSSA-02-1-000-11-Abst-PDF/JSSA-02-1-031-11-022-Wadesango-N/JSSA-02-1-031-11-022-Wadesango-N-Tt.pdf.

44. Yousefi, A., Bazrafkan, L., & Yaman, N. (2015). A qualitative inquiry into the challenges and complexities of research supervision: viewpoints of postgraduate students and faculty members. J Adv Med Educ Prof. 3(3), 91–98. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4530006/.