THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Collaborative Motivation for Sustainable Learning and Successful Completion of Doctoral Studies: A Case of Daystar University Lecturers in Nairobi County, Kenya

Dr. Mary M. Mogute
Senior Lecturer, Daystar University, Kenya

Abstract:
Just like the rest of the world, the demand for doctoral studies in Kenya is on the rise (Gudo, Olel & Oanda, 2011). The desire to acquire knowledge and skills to prospect for better opportunities, increase social status and most importantly for lecturers in Kenyan universities, to secure their current jobs in their teaching careers are the driving forces behind this trend (Gudo, et al, 2011; Nganga, 2013). The Commission for University Education (CUE) in Kenya requires all university lecturers to have PhD (CUE, 2014). As a result of this, there has been an upsurge of doctoral enrolment in Kenyan universities, especially from among university lecturers without doctoral degrees, who have hurriedly registered to beat the August 2018 deadline set by CUE. The CUE (2014) harmonized university guidelines ratio for theses supervision is 1:3 for doctorate supervision and 1:5 for masters supervision. However, in practice supervisors have more students than recommended, thus, operating above the recommended threshold. As a result, supervisors are overburdened, a practice that could compromise the quality of teaching and supervision while students are not able to move with anticipated speed. This could lead to student de-motivation, however motivated they may have been at the time of enrolment. This study sought to establish the role of collaborative motivation as a strategy of enhancing sustainable learning, supervision and successful completion of doctoral degrees. This study used descriptive survey design. The sample comprised of Daystar University lecturers enrolled for doctoral studies at the time of fieldwork. Census sampling technique was used to select the respondents. Semi- structured questionnaires were used for data collection. Obtained data was organized, analyzed and interpreted to make deductions. Results of the study pointed out the importance of collaborative motivation in the pursuance of doctoral degrees and suggest better practices that could be adopted to enhance collaborative motivation critical for sustainable learning and successful completion of doctoral degrees.

Keywords: Collaborative, sustainable learning, motivation, doctorate studies, supervisor, supervisee and completion of doctoral studies

1. Introduction and Background

The demand for higher education in Kenya, especially doctoral studies is on the rise just as it is in other parts of the world (Gudo, Olel & Oanda, 2011). In Kenya, this demand has been caused by the desire for the students to acquire knowledge and skills that would help them to prospect for better jobs, secure their current jobs as well as increase their social status or positions in the society. Besides, the current job market in Kenya has become extremely competitive, only the 'best' and 'qualified' are considered for certain types of jobs (Gudo, et al., 2011). For instance, in the Kenyan Commission for University Education (CUE) publication (2014) of harmonized university regulations, the government of Kenya requires all university lecturers in the country to have doctoral degrees to qualify to teach at the university level (CUE, 2014).

The harmonized University regulations by CUE (2014) have lead to increased demand by university lecturers without PhD to enroll in order to meet their employment academic threshold. More than ever before, there has been an upsurge of doctoral studies admissions in Kenyan universities (Gudo, et al, 2011). Though there are many reasons that warrant increased demand for PhD qualifications, in Kenya university lecturers without PhD have been literally "forced" to enroll as a requirement to beat the August 2018 CUE deadline. Those lecturers, who would not have graduated with PhDs by this time, will assume the position of tutorial fellows as they wait to complete their PhD studies. This explains the demand and urgency for enrolment by university lecturers. Completion of their doctoral studies will facilitate them in keeping their jobs and retain their already assumed professional titles.

This notwithstanding, the general trend in Kenya has shown steady increase in student enrolment in universities. As Nganga (2013) observes, this trend has led to increased student-lecturer ratio, which varies from university to university

across the country. For public universities, Kenyatta University records the highest student ration of 1:65, followed by Moi University with 1:47, University of Nairobi with 1:36 and the other universities' ration range between 1:31 to 1:39. This shows that some of the institutions operate above the threshold of 1:50 for theoretical oriented courses and 1:20 for practical oriented courses (CUE, 2011). As far as supervision is concerned, CUE supervision guidelines provide for supervision student-teacher ratio of 1:3 for doctorate level and 1:5 for masters level (CUE, 2014). However, in practice, most universities do not adhere to these guidelines as postgraduate supervisors are allocated up to 20 doctoral and masters' students at a time, much higher beyond CUE threshold (Muchiri, Tanui & Kalai, 2016). This translates into heavy workload for the lecturers as they teach undergraduate and graduate courses and at the same time supervise graduate students' theses. To make this worse, some 'qualified' lectures, ordinarily referred to as senior lecturers or professors are engaged in additional university administrative, management and other extraneous university responsibilities such as research and consultancy. These responsibilities consume a lot of time the lecturer's could have used to teach and supervise theses (Muchiri, et al., 2016).

The heavy workload is likely to leave lecturers overworked and overwhelmed, a state that leads to their non-availability or general inability to effectively supervise assigned students since their hands are full. Consequently, supervisors are likely to be un-available to guide their students. If available, they may be irritable, un-accommodative, threatening or in a hurry as they guide their students. Often, this makes them to go round in circles and mark time while registering minimum progress together with their supervisees (Muchiri, et al., 2016). On the contrary, if supervisors exert themselves to meet their supervision requirements and deadlines to the satisfaction of every supervisee, they are likely to overstretch themselves and chances of experiencing burnout coupled with some degree of de-motivation, uncalled for during students' supervision, are high (Knudsen, et al, 2008). Burn out and fatigue could result into supervisors' frustration, and in turn they may, unintentionally frustrate their supervisees. Ultimately, this could make competent supervisors ineffective as they feel overwhelmed, de-motivated and lethargic and in some cases, they mayhibernate to recuperate. As this goes on, supervisees are not spared of frustration emanating from unexplained delays in keeping up with their progressive time frames and 'ineffective' supervision (Muchiri, et al., 2016). At this point, supervisors who are expected to motivate their supervisees fail to perform this critical role because they themselves are de-motivated.

On the other hand, as argued by (Kirsi, et al., 2012), it is not easy for doctoral students to undertake their studies without support from highly motivated supervisors. Though doctoral candidates fall in a category of select group intellectually and far as scholarship matters are concerned, some never finish their studies because they lack necessary guidance, encouragement and motivation that should come from supervisors. Further, studies by (Kurtz, Helmke &Ulkusteiner, 2006; Toews, Lockyer, Dobson & Brownell, 1993) have documented that lack of progress in students' research topics, awkward relationship with supervisors, sense of isolation, identity indecision and high levels of stress hinder the student from making anticipated progress. This eventually leads to increased dropout rates of doctoral students, which range between 30% to 50% of all doctoral candidates enrolled in different disciplines and countries (Kirsi et al., 2012). Those who do not dropout take long (7-10years) to complete their studies (GraduateSchoolHub.com). The explanation that could be attached to such high dropout rates is frustration leading to de-motivation to pursue studies in the face of mounting challenging experiences.

Though motivation is an individual phenomenon, Nolen and Ward (2008) argue that motivation can also be influenced by social interactions students engage in and the environment studies are undertaken. These three factors (motivation, social interaction and environment) are mutually integrated since individual motivation is internally and externally spurred. However, besides lack of motivation, (Kirsi et al., 2012) argues that there are several challenges that doctoral students encounter, such as; institutional factors, supervision, knowledge and skills acquisition, learning abilities, assessment practices, and personal factors that could intensify feelings of de-motivation. Therefore, successful completion of doctoral studies by registered candidates is influenced by; students' self- determination, self-regulation and self-motivation (intrinsic) complimented by availability of motivated and motivating supervisors in healthy scholarly communities (extrinsic) (Zhao, Golde & McCormick, 2007).

Motivated students have intrinsic drive to stick to their task, learn and complete their studies. This drive comes from anticipated rewards that accompany completion of doctoral studies. High levels of intrinsic motivation sustain students' focus and enhance their ability to manage stress. Such students are less likely to experience burnout because they are able to regulate themselves and develop value systems that allow their behavior and actions to be sustained with minimal support from external sources (Pisarik, 2009; & sass.queensu.ac/learning strategies/). On the other hand, extrinsic motivation comes from external sources such as supervisors and the scholarly community or environment. This includes; learning experiences, assessment criteria, quality of supervision, relationship between students and supervisors, availability of supervisors, supervisors' commitment to read and correct students' work and availability of resources among others. These external factors are likely to translate into sustainable learning and completion of students' studies. As observed by Kiley (2006), these factors uphold promotion of students' scholarly development, sustenance and completion of their studies. Further, (Kirsi et al., 2012), confirms that supervisors can enhance students' performance by adopting student-centered approaches that guide them to develop necessary competencies needed for self-motivation and completion of their doctoral studies.

From the foregoing, it is evident that doctoral students' de-motivation lead to feelings of inadequacy, dissatisfaction and frustration that result in attrition as further confirmed by Gardner, (2008) and Golde (1998). If such students are assigned equally de-motivated supervisors, the pairs will form non-working teams leading attrition. It is with this understanding that the findings of this study sought to establish the place of collaborative motivation as a precursor to successful learning,

supervision, and completion of doctoral studies and proffer suitable and contextualized recommendations for adoption by learning institutions as a strategy of promoting effective doctoral supervisee-supervisor collaborative motivation towards sustainable learning and completion of doctoral studies. Since no similar studies have been done among Daystar University lecturers who are pursuing doctoral studies, and in Kenya as a country, the study endeavors to fill this scholarly gap and contribute to global data in this field. It is hoped that knowledge generated will contribute to easing the process of obtaining doctoral degrees in Kenya and beyond.

2. Objectives of the Study
The objectives that guided this study sought to;
1. identify the level of motivation of Daystar University lecturers towards sustainable learning and completion of their doctoral studies,
2. establish factors influencing student-centered motivation of Daystar University lecturers towards sustainable learning and completion of their doctoral studies,
3. investigate students' perceptions of their supervisor's contribution in motivating them towards sustainable learning and completion of their doctoral studies,
4. explore the factors that de-motivate Daystar University lecturers registered for doctoral studies from sustainable learning and timely completion of their studies, and
5. proffer strategies that could be adopted to promote collaborative motivation between doctoral supervisees and supervisors in enhancing sustainable learning and completion of studies.

3. Materials and Methods
This study adopted a cross-sectional descriptive survey design. The study population was University lecturers enrolled for doctoral studies while the target population was all lecturers enrolled for doctoral studies at Daystar University. A total of 45lecturers from Daystar University who were enrolled for doctoral studies at the time of fieldwork for this research formed the study sample. Because the sample size was small, census-sampling design was adopted and all the 45 respondents were sent introductory emails with attached self-administered semi-structured questionnaires to fill and email it back to the researcher after two working days. Desk review was also used to collect secondary data obtained from journal, books and other documentations. Quantitative data was processed and analyzed using SPSS version 23 while qualitative data was classified thematically, coded and analyzed. The study utilized descriptive statistics to facilitate analysis and interpretation of data. Study findings were presented in tables, frequencies, percentages and narrative descriptions.

4. Results and Discussions of Findings
In this study, a total of 45 self-administered semi-structured questionnaires were emailed to Daystar University lecturers who were enrolled for doctoral studies. Out of 45(100%), 31(69%) were returned dully filled. The respondents belonged to different schools within the university and were distributed as follows; 13(43.3%) were from the school of human and social sciences, which houses the department of psychology with 6(20%), development studies 5(16.7%), and child development 1(3.3%) of the respondents respectively. There were 10(33.3%) respondents from the school of business and economics who were distributed as follows; commerce 9(30%) and economics 1(3.3%). The other 6(20%) of the respondents belonged to the school of science, engineering and health; where in nursing they were 2(6.7%), science and engineering 2(6.7%) and computer science 2(6.7%). The remaining 2(6.7%) respondents came from the school of communication, language and performing arts represented by the department of humanities 1(3.3%) and department of performing arts 1(3.3%). The findings indicate fair representation of Daystar University schools in the academic division. Hence, the findings of this study can be generalized to the entire community of Daystar University and beyond.

This study endeavored to find out the official number of years doctoral candidates take to complete their PhD. The findings revealed that 12(46.2%) of the respondents reported that ideally their studies ought to take three years, 9(34.6%) four years and 3(11.5%) five years while the remaining 2(7.7%) were to take three and half years to graduate as stipulated in their relevant university graduate studies handbooks. Therefore, the average official period of study for doctoral programs in which the respondents were enrolled ranged from 3-5 years. However, even with this clear specification of the number of years students should take to complete their studies, data from the field pointed out that 1(3.6%) of the respondents who enrolled for doctoral studies in 2010, had already spent eight years in the program, 3(10.7%) commenced their studies in 2011, seven years ago, another 3(10.7%) started their studies in 2012, six years ago, while 5(17.9%) started in 2013, five years ago. Quite a number 8(28.6%) embarked on their studies in 2014, hence they had been pursuing their studies for the last four years, the other 4(14.3%) started their studies in 2015, while 3(10.7%) started in 2016 and the remaining 1(3.6%) embarked on their studies in 2017. Based on these findings, 12(43%) of the respondents had been pursuing their doctoral studies for more than five years while the remaining 16(57%) had been on their studies for less than four years. Therefore, there is evidence that most doctoral candidates take longer than the stipulated time of 3-5 years to complete their doctoral studies. This finding is not unique to the Daystar University faculty members pursuing doctoral studies, but it is a common practice in Kenya as observed by Amutabi (2011) who reports that most Kenyan students undertaking doctoral studies delay

in completing their studies. This finding is reinforced by (GraduateSchoolHub.com) report, which states that it takes between 7-10 years for doctoral students to complete their studies.

Further investigation revealed that 27(90%) of the respondents were enrolled in programs with course work while 3(10%) were research-based. For those respondents who were undertaking course work, 23(85.2%) had completed course while 4(14.8%) had not. It is worth noting that majority 19(82.6%) of the respondents who were undertaking course work completed it within the stipulated period of not more than two years while 4(17.4%) indicated that they took between two and half years to five years to complete course work. Further, majority (80.8%) of the respondents completed their course work within the stipulated timeframe while only 5(19.2%) did not. Those who had finished course work were working on their theses at different levels (proposal, fieldwork or report writing). When asked when they expected to complete their doctoral programs given their speed and progress, 14(50%) of the respondents hoped to graduate in 2018, another 6(21.4%) in 2019, while 3(10.7%) hoped to graduate by the end of 2017 and the remaining 2(7.1%) hoped to graduate in the year 2020. It is worth noting that students who had enrolled for their doctoral studies in 2010 hoped to complete in 2020.

4.1. Level of Students' Motivation towards Sustainable Learning

In response to objective one, the study sought to identify the level of students' motivation towards sustainable learning and completion of their doctoral studies. Since this study was about collaborative motivation, it was important to ascertain the level of the respondents' motivation. A five point Likerts' scale with strongly disagree (1), agree (2), no opinion (3), agree (4) and strongly agree (5) was used to capture respondents' opinions. The findings revealed that majority 23(76.7%) of the respondents reported that they were motivated as they worked towards completion of their doctoral studies while 6(20%) respondents indicated that they were not motivated and the remaining 1(3.3%) remained neutral. It is worth noting that one candidate who was highly de-motivated had dropped out of the program. This implies that motivation is important to sustain candidates' commitment and persistence towards the completion of their PhD studies as argued by Bair and Haworth (1999) and Cardona (2013).

The study further sought to find out if the respondents enjoyed their studies as they went through their various doctoral programs. The findings generated revealed that 15(50%) agreed and 11(36.7%) strongly agreed that they enjoyed their studies whiles 1(3.3%) strongly disagreed and another 1(3.3%) reported that they did not find satisfaction in their studies. However, 2(6.7%) respondents expressed no opinion to indicate whether they enjoyed their studies or not. The respondents were also asked if they were satisfied with the progress they had made in their studies and in response to this question, 11(36.7%) agreed that they were satisfied with their current progress, 6(20%) strongly disagreed, 7(23.3%) disagreed while 2(6.7%) strongly agreed that their progress was satisfactory and the remaining 4(13.3%) had no opinion about their progress. This finding revealed that 43.3% of the respondents were not satisfied with their current progress while 42.7% were satisfied and the remaining 13.3% had no opinion about their level of satisfaction.

To probe about the level of students' excitement with their research topics, 14(46.7%) strongly agreed while 14(46.7%) agreed that their study topics were interesting and exciting to them. Generally, majority (93.4%) of the respondents were excited with their doctoral research topics. On the contrary, only 1(3.3%) respondent found their area of study not exciting while another 1(3.3%) respondent had no opinion. This finding shows that the respondents were doing doctoral research in areas they were passionate about, hence the excitement. Similarly, 13(43.3%) of the respondents strongly agreed and another 13(43.3%) agreed that they were learning a lot through their research work. On the contrary, only 2(6.7%) disagreed that they were learning from their research process and the remaining 2(6.7%) remained neutral. Hence, the majority (86.6%) of the respondents viewed their doctoral journey as a learning experience. Finally, to ascertain the level of respondents' motivation towards learning, they were asked whether their doctoral journey was a good experience or not. In response to this question, diverse views were generated with 9(31%) strongly agreed and 8(27.6%) respondents agreed that their doctoral journey was a good experience. On the contrary, 6(20.7%) disagreed and 4(13.8%) strongly disagreed that their doctoral journey was a good experience and the remaining 2(6.7%) had no opinion about this. Generally, the study finding revealed that 58.6% of the respondents had good experiences as they journeyed through their doctoral programs while 34.5% did not and the remaining 6.7% were not sure of their experiences.

Generally, the findings under this section generated a continuum of opinions on the level of respondents' motivation. On one extreme, there were those who were very motivated and on the other extreme, those who were de-motivated to pursue their studies. Under normal circumstances, this is expected because different people enroll for doctoral studies for different reasons and expectations. Besides, their experiences and learning environment vary leading to different levels of motivation. Cardona (2013) observes that different factors stimulate and control human motivation and behavior. Consequently, respondents' intrinsic level of motivation to undertake and complete doctoral studies could be influenced by different factors. These factors affect individuals' self-determination, consistent learning and completion (Cardona, 2013). It can therefore be implied that the stronger the respondents' intrinsic stimuli, the higher, their level of motivation.

4.2. Factors Influencing Student-Centered Motivation

In objective two, the study endeavored to establish factors that influenced student-centered motivation among the respondents pursuing doctoral programs. Several statements were provided to the respondents who were required to use a five point Likerts' scale with strongly disagree (1), agree (2), no opinion (3), agree (4) and strongly agree (5) to capture their

views. From the findings, it was revealed that 19(65.5%) of the respondents strongly agreed and 6(20.7%) agreed that career requirement for lecturers to be holders of doctoral degrees was a motivating factor that influenced them to undertake their studies. Hence, majority (86.2%) of the respondents identified career requirements as an important factor that sustained and motivated them to remain consistent in their studies. The remaining 4(13.8%) expressed no opinion whether their career requirements to have doctoral degree influenced their self-centered motivation or not. This finding is consistent with the finding of a study by Burgess and Wellington (2010) who indicates that doctoral qualifications may have a direct impact on one's career development and progression with regard to promotion, salary increments and social status achieved within the work place setting. This argument is given emphasis by Cardona (2013), who argues that doctoral studies help to develop peoples' career paths. Besides, this achievement is later translated into resilience, perseverance and self-determination; traits needed for effective management of work-related and personal stressors.

In the same way, 24(82.8%) of the respondents revealed that the stiff job market competition influenced their motivation to register for doctoral programs to remain relevant and competitive. However, 5(17.2%) of the respondents had no opinion regarding this. As documented by (CUE, 2014) in the harmonized university regulations, all university lecturers are required to have doctoral degrees by August 2018. Therefore, in Kenya, university lecturers must have doctoral degrees as the minimum job entry requirement to remain competitive and part of the community of scholars. Similar sentiments are presented by (Gudo, et al., 2011) who confirms that current job market in Kenya is very competitive that only the 'best' and 'qualified' are considered.

Desire for knowledge and contribution in generating new knowledge in their areas of specializations was also identified as a factor that motivated the respondents to pursue doctoral studies as reported by 27(90%) of the respondents while 3(10%) remained neutral. This finding corroborates with the work of Isaak and Hubert (1999), who points out that research undertaken by doctoral students give emphasis to originality and critical thinking that eventually culminates into generation of new knowledge useful in addressing societal needs and problems. This finding is reinforced by the observations made by Naveed (2015) that universities are think tanks of policy formulation and knowledge generation. Universities have a potential of using interdisciplinary knowledge, theoretical frameworks and methodological rigor to conduct research that responds to societal needs and problems.

Another motivating factor that influenced the respondents to remain focusedon their doctoral programs was the desire to meaningfully invest in their own lives through education was reported by an overwhelming majority of 27(90%). To them, doctoral studies are worthwhile personal investments that could transform their future lives and socio-economic status in general. This finding affirms the report by Blundell, Dearden, Meghir and Sianesi (1999) who relate the contribution made by education and training to individual and the general growth of the economy. Therefore, prospecting for future dividends was one of the reasons behind the respondents' willingness to invest in doctoral studies.

Further investigation revealed that the respondents were motivated to pursue doctoral studies because there was an opportunities available to them as reported by 21(72.4%) of the respondents. Nevertheless, there were 2(6.9%) who strongly disagreed and 2(6.9%) who disagreed that it is not about available opportunities but out of self-sacrifice and self-denial. The remaining 4(13.8%) expressed no views about this statement. This study finding confirms the report by Cassuto (2013) who observes that not all the people can undertake doctoral studies because they either do not havecapacity, interest or resources. Though some have ability, their priorities are different.

Further probing revealed that 14(46.7%) of the respondents reported that they were undertaking doctoral studies to improve their social status while 9(30%) did not share this sentiment and the remaining 7(23.3%) expressed no opinion about this statement. This finding reinforces the report by Blundell, et al.(1999) who argues that completion of doctoral studies raises people's social status among peers, in organizations and society in general. Hence, making it a factor that motivates some people to undertake doctoral studies. However, (Farkas, 2014) remarks that though doctoral programs are assets for most professionals, they may not be worthwhile investments for other people because money invested for studies could be channeled into business or retirement investment options, a view fortified by The Economist (2010).

Similarly, the respondents were asked to indicate whether family expectations was a motivating factor that influenced their pursuance of doctoral studies. In response to this, 8(26.7%) of the respondents disagreed and 5(16.7%) strongly disagreed to this statement. On the other hand, 7(23.3%) agreed and 6(20%) strongly agreed that this was a strong motivation that helped them to remain focused because in one way or the other they were accountable to the members of their families and they had to stand out as good role models especially to the young members who looked up to them as mentors. Yet, another 4(13.3%) respondents had no opinion with regard to this statement. This finding corroborate with the findings of Brailsford (2010) who reported that some of the participants in his study were encouraged with family members while some were hesitant to do so due to the uncertainty and risk involved incompleting doctoral studies. This repeats itself in the current study because there are (43.3%) who indicate that their motivation came from family while 43.4% of the respondents reported that they were not motivated by family members to pursue and complete their doctoral studies.

A similar question was posed to find out if friends' encouragement motivated the respondents to pursue their doctorate studies and 18(60.2%) of the respondents revealed that friends' encouragement was instrumental in motivating them to continue working on their doctoral programs. A similar study by Brailsford (2010) reveals friends; who were either enrolled for or those who had finished doctoral studies inspired participants to pursue and complete their doctorate programs. This study also established that majority 25(83.4%) of the respondents reported that they stuck to their program

and worked towards completion because they desired to be good role models to the young people within and outside of their families, more especially their own children. This finding is consistent with the views by Brailsford (2010) who opinionates that besides the support the participants in their study got from their families and friends, they were motivated to remain consistent and committed to their studies up to the end because they perceived themselves as role models to others who had desires to pursue doctoral studies. Hence, their success was not just personal but corporate achievement together with those who looked up to them as sources of inspiration.

Lastly, 14(46.6%) of the respondents reported that they were not pursuing their doctoral studies because it was trendy while 7(23.4%) were committed to finishing their doctoral studies because it was trendy and cool to earn a PhD degree in the modern society. However, a good number 9(30%) of the respondents expressed no opinion about this statement. The 46.6% of the respondents who reported that having doctoral degree was trendy are in agreement with the findings in a study by Charikleia (2014), who states that earning a doctorate degree is trendy and highly valued as the key that 'ignites' economic growth and development, besides enhancing personal and societal development through knowledge generation, skill creation and transfer of the same from a few think tanks to the wider society. Besides, in most countries, PhD is a basic requirement for a career in academia (The Economist, 2010). In summary, the findings of this study established that student-centered motivation of the respondents was pegged on intrinsic motivation associated with prospective personal benefits and growth that comes with successful completion of doctorate studies and the social network of individual candidates.

4.3. Students' Perceptions of Supervisors' Role in Motivating Supervisees

Objective three of the study sought to investigate students' perceptions on the role of supervisors in motivating them towards sustainable learning and completion of doctoral studies. A five point Likerts' scale with strongly disagree (1), agree (2), no opinion (3), agree (4) and strongly agree (5) was used to capture respondents' perceptions. Though there are many intrinsic factors that influence students' motivation as discussed in section 4.2, this section of the study focused on supervisors' role. The findings are presented in the subsequent paragraphs.

The study sought to establish whether supervisors' positive attitudes contributed to students' motivation, majority 23(76.6%) of the respondents reported that their supervisors' positive attitudes motivated them to remain on course. On the other hand, 4(13.3%) of the respondents were not of this opinion while another 3(10%) remained neutral. The findings of this study corroborate with findings of studies done by Abiddin, (2012) and Cullen, Pearsons and Spear (1994) who observed that supportive and positive attitudes from supervisors greatly enhanced students' motivation, which finally culminated to successful completion of their studies. Sanlair (2011) further argues that lack of supervisors' positive attitude; demotivate students in spite of whatever amount of effort they put in through self-centered determination and motivation.

Further, the study endeavored to find out if positive supervisor-supervisee relationship contributed to sustained motivation. The finding revealed that 21(70%) of the respondents were of the view that their relationship with their supervisors was a basis for their sustained motivation to stay on course. This finding reinforces the findings by Phillips and Pugh (2000) who opinionate that healthy supervisor-supervisee relationship is vital in completion of doctoral studies. Paccinin (2000) concurs with this by stating that supervisor-supervisee relationship should integrate personal and professional elements to encourage and mentor supervisees while exemplifying their professional expertise in the subject area under investigation. This demands for effective inter-personal skills from supervisors and supervisees, without which the doctoral studies journey could be miserable and frustrating.

In an effort to find out the respondents' perceptions on whether their supervisors encouraged them as they gambled with the uncertainties of doctoral studies, 18(60%) of the respondents reported that their supervisors' encouragement was key in motivating them towards learning and completion of their doctoral studies. On the hand, 7(23.3%) of the respondents did not perceive their supervisors as encouraging while 5(16.7%) expressed no views on this. Haksever and Manisali (2000) argue that supervisors ought to give supervisees constant encouragement, support and reassurance as a strategy of sustaining their motivation. However, a report by Amutabi (2011) reveals that some supervisors have personal issues that negatively affect and demotivate their supervisees.

In the same way, the respondents were asked whether their motivation depended on supervisor's appreciation of their efforts towards learning. The findings showed that 16(53.3%) of the respondents were of the view that their supervisors appreciated their efforts and this led to their own motivation. However, 5(16.6%) reported that their supervisors' did not appreciate them. They felt their efforts were not even recognized; leave alone appreciated by their supervisors. It is worth noting that a large proportion 9(30%) of respondents expressed no opinion about this issue. Niemiec (2014) argues that expressing appreciation is demonstrating value for someone else. Therefore, there is need for supervisors and supervisees to express appreciation for each other's efforts as they work through their common projects. Similarly, Kashdan & Brean, 2007; Chen, 2013 and Chen & Wu, 2014) observe that appreciation is important because it boosts positive emotions and energy, optimism and well being which ultimately contribute to the ability to work together as a team for effective performance.

Further, the findings of the study shows that 19(63.4%) of the respondents reported that they were motivated to keep on with their studies until they complete their programs because their supervisors treated them with respect while 6(20%) had a contrary view to this and the remaining 5(16.7%) expressed no opinion about this statement. From the finding,a majority (63.4%) of respondents perceived respectful treatment from their supervisors as a motivating factorfor their studies. This corroborates with the observations made by Dillon (2016) that human beings need to be respected just because they are

human. In addition to this, doctoral students have two more reasons to be respected by their mentors; for demonstrating courage to undertake PhD, a journey known to be dark, lonely and uncertain, and for anticipated contribution they will make in knowledge creation towards solving human problems. When doctoral students feel respected as critical contributors in scholarship, their motivation to pursue and complete their studies gets elevated.

The respondents were further asked if their supervisors' availability motivated them in their doctoral studies and the findings revealed that 16(53.3%) of them felt motivated by their supervisor's availability to academically guide. On the other hand, 11(36.7%) did not think that their supervisor's availability contributed to their motivation in any way while the remaining 3(10%) remained neutral. This finding confirms the work of Gallegher (2013) whose report shows that supervisors who are available help their students to achieve and maintain scholastic potential. However, Amutabi (2011) argues that in most cases, supervisors' availability is not guaranteed even with prior appointments. The report revealed that most supervisors taught in different universities and practically had no free time to guide their supervisees. As a result of this, supervisees literally 'chase' after supervisors to consult and get the most needed feedback. When available, supervisors spend very little time with supervisees, leaving them more confused and frustrated. This affects students' motivation, progress and quality of their theses or dissertations (Amutabi, 2011).

For doctoral supervision, feedback from supervisors is critical because it gives supervisees constructive scholarly criticism. Therefore, this study sought to find out the role of supervisors' prompt feedback in motivating students towards learning and completion of doctoral studies. Analyzed data revealed that 15(50%) of the respondents were of the view that their supervisors' prompt feedback challenged and motivated them to work hard while 12(40%) did not perceive their supervisors' feedback as a motivation. The remaining 3(10%) of the respondents were neutral. As reported by 50% of the respondents, prompt feedback is an important motivating factor. However, Amutabi (2011) remarks that many students in Kenyan universities are not clear as when to expect feedback from supervisors after handing in their work since, for many, there are no pre-planned supervision schedules. Ideally, supervision schedules should be based on agreed schedules and this makes supervisor-supervisee accountable to each other. Therefore, lack of clear guidelines and expectations leads to lack of accountability. This eventually slows down students' progress and could be a serious cause of supervisees' demotivation (Amutabi, 2011).

Supervisors' effective guidance was also identified as another factor by 18(60%) who stated that they remained motivated to continue with their studies because their supervisors gave them effective guidance. Nevertheless, 5(16.7%) did not think effective guidance was a key-motivating factor while 7(23.3%) had no opinion regarding this. As the findings of this study show, effective guidance is important in students' motivation as reinforced by Gallegher (2014), who documents that effective guidance increases students' potential to succeed because they know what to do and how to do it.

The other factor the respondents considered as important in motivation is positive criticism by supervisors as reported by 21(70%) of the respondents while 6(20%) disagreed to this sentiment and 3(10%) of the respondents expressed no opinion about this statement. This finding corroborate with the views by (Handrie, 2007) which observes that, when perceived positively, criticism energizes and builds students, boosts team functioning and enhances performance. It also leads to healthy interaction that promotes critical thinking and reflection; much needed ingredients in graduate studies and research.

Likewise, 24(82.8%) of the respondents perceived supervisors' competence in their relevant fields of study as key to sustainable learning and completion of doctoral studies while 1(3.4%) strongly disagreed to this view and 4(13.8%) remained neutral. Effective supervision requires supervisors' knowledge and skills research field and areas of specialization (Gallgher, 2014). Supervisors are expected to guide students in establishing the direction of study, facilitating students' access to and acquisition to study materials and research methodology. This in return stimulates and motivates the students to stick to the task. www.grad.ubc.ca/current-students/supervisor-advising/research-supervisor

The study further explored any additional supervisors' attributes that contributed to motivating the respondents and the findings generated revealed that 12(30%) of the respondent were motivated because their supervisors' assistance in identifying and accessing reading materials,6(15%) were willingness to have prompt meetings with supervisees, 6(15%) of the supervisors shared personal experiences with supervisees that inspired them,5(12.5%) of the supervisors encouraged students to research and publish with them, another 5(12.5%) informed their students of opportunities to attend workshops and seminars with them while 4(10%) perceived that their supervisors' effectively integrated course work with thesis supervision to help students establish relationships between theory and use of scientific research to address emerging issues and problems. Finally, the remaining 2(5%) of the supervisors guide their students on how to source for funding for their studies.

Besides specific supervisor-centered motivational factors that encouraged supervisees sustainable learning and completion of doctoral programs, the respondents identified the following additional factors that enhanced their motivation; 10(28.6%) of the respondents stated personal drive as the main factors that sustained their motivation in their studies, another 8(23%) of the respondents cited supervisors' and family expectations, 6(17%) felt that clear guidelines given by supervisors was a motivating factor, 5(14.5%) of the respondents reported that constant follow-up by supervisors and the university in general to find out where students are motivated them to stick to the task. Another 2(5.7%) respondents stuck to their doctoral programs because their colleagues held them accountable and encouraged them to make progress, 2(5.7%) of the respondents stated that their employer constantly reminded them that without a PhD their jobs were at risk while

another 2(5.7%) were able to stick to their studies because their employer, Daystar University had partially funded their programs and needed proof in terms of progress reports that their studies were worth institutional investment.

4.4. De-motivating Factors Hampering Sustainable Learning and Completion of Doctoral Studies

Since every good thing has its challenges, the respondents were asked to identify some of the de-motivating factors that frustrate and discourage them from pursuing their studies towards completion. This question attracted multiple responses from the respondents, 16(14.2%) of the respondents reported that unavailable supervisors posed a serious challenge that de-motivated them. They remarked that their supervisors were too busy and difficult to find even with appointments. This finding was reinforced by the sentiments shared by one of the respondents who stated that;

Getting appointments with my supervisor is hard. He does do not pick my calls nor does he return my short text messages (SMS). It forces me to personally go looking for him at the university. This has forced me to know his lecturing timetable, so that I can 'catch' him after his lectures. Even then, he does not give me time to share with him my challenges. He quickly tells me he is going for a meeting or class. He then asks me to send my work to him through email. After wasting my time and money to look for him, I only get about ten minutes un-thoughtful discussion with my supervisor. Anyway, I send my work on email, but several weeks after he says he never saw it, I send the work again. This is repeated over and over again and it leaves me frustrated and highly de-motivated. I do not know whether I will ever finish this thing called PhD!

The other factor that was identified by 15(13.3%) of the respondents as a challenge was the cost of PhD programs especially for self-sponsored students. Fees for PhD programs in Kenya are high for most middle class Kenyans. Hence, some of the students are forced to defer their studies for a semester or so to look for money to clear fees balances before they are allowed to move to the next level. For instance, one respondent reported that;

My proposal was ready for defense two months ago, but I have not been able to defend because I have fees balance that must be cleared before I am scheduled for defense. This puts me in an awkward crossroad, whether to pay my own fees first or that of my children. Often I give my children's fees first priority and I come last. Definitely, this slows down my speed and progress towards completion of my doctorate studies.

Another 14(12.4%) of the respondents reported that time is a major constraint that slowed down their progress. The respondents were not just doctoral students but also faculty members in their respective departments. Besides, they assumed many other family and social responsibilities that needed their time and attention. Yet, another 12(10.6%) revealed that balancing between school, work and other social responsibilities was overwhelming, leaving them fatigued and most often than not de-motivated. Likewise, 11(9.7%) of the respondents indicated that delayed feedback from supervisors was a de-motivating factor. Without feedback, it is difficult to progress because one is not sure whether they are on truck or not. This is compounded by lack of clear guidelines from some the supervisors or sometimes conflicting guidelines from multiple supervisors as reported by 10(8.8%) of the respondents.

Another 10(8.8%) of the respondents pointed out that public universities' strikes witnessed in Kenya of recent times had significantly slowed down their progress as they lack consistency in their studies given the go slow mood of their supervisors while they are on strike, ultimately this affects students' progress. Some 5(4.4%) respondents also felt that some supervisors for unknown reasons were partial as they favored some students at the expense of others while 5(4.4%) respondents reported lack of current and relevant books in their areas of specialization as a setback. Therefore besides the process of supervision, this study pointed out a number of other factors that contribute to sluggish progression and de-motivation of students.

4.5. Mitigation Strategies

As a way of mitigating the challenges discussed in section 4.4, respondents were asked to suggest strategies that could be adopted to strengthen collaborative motivation between the supervisors and the supervisees. Resultantly, 31(11.8%) of them reported the need for strict national regulation on supervisor-supervisee ratio that can control the number of supervisees the supervisor is assigned. Another 29(11%) of the respondents suggested the need for more support of students by their supervisors. This means that the supervisors should be available, willing to give students scholarly direction through prompt feedbacks, and being a constant encouragement and motivator to their students. Yet, another 28(10.7%) of the respondents pointed out the need for enhanced availability and commitment on the part of supervisors. It is only through this that they can be of help to their students.

As an administrative strategy, 25(9.5%) of the respondents suggested the need to introduce supervision tracking that could hold both students and supervisors accountable to each other and to the university while 23(8.8%) pointed out the need for regular supervisory meetings as determined by a supervisory pre-determined schedule which should be strictly adhered to by both parties. Another 28(10.7%) of the respondents' suggested the need to reduce supervisor's workload to make them more effective and efficient in their supervisory roles. This would make available for their students and facilitate them to give prompt feedback to their supervisees.

Similarly, 22(8.4) of the respondents suggested the need for professionalism in supervision where issues like partiality, tribalism, unfairly awarded grades and taking advantage of students' vulnerability will not be heard. Besides, 20(7.6%) of the respondents suggested the need for clear policies and guidelines for thesis supervision while 19(7.3%) revealed the need for improved supervisor-supervisee relationships to enhance students' motivation. Further, 15(5.7%) of the respondents suggested the need to allocate supervisees qualified and competent supervisors who can guide them through the process of research. Once they realize they are in safe hands of competent supervisors, they will be motivated to learn from their mentors. Yet, another 10(3.8%) respondents felt it was necessary, when need be, to allow change of supervisors without victimizing the supervisees, especially in cases of strained relationships between the two parties. Finally, 10(3.8%) of the respondents argued that there was need to increase payment for supervision as a strategy to motivate supervisors who need to feel appreciated both by the administration and the supervisees, for them to do good supervisory job.

Finally, the respondents suggested the need to review the Kenyan postgraduate system that tends to frustrate students. Just like the rest of the world, learning to generate new knowledge should be the key motivation behind supervisor-supervisee relationships without unnecessarily frustrating and punishing the learner. There is need to develop standardized doctoral supervision criteria applicable across the universities to facilitate in a similar way all PhD candidates in the country for uniformity and quality assurance purposes. Students at all cost should be assured of maximum support from the universities they are registered in through enhanced customer care services as a way of reaching out to the students and in return make them comfortable as they learn in a conducive friendly environment supported by supervisors and credible systems. This will consequently result into collaborative motivation that can ensure students' sustained learning and resultant completion of their doctoral programs.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, this study established that the level of student-centered motivation was high for most students but there were those who were de-motivated and were struggling with their studies. One respondent had even dropped out of the program. Further, the study findings revealed that intrinsic level of motivation for students to undertake and complete doctoral studies was important but it was influenced by several extrinsic factors. Besides, this study established that student-centered motivation was anchored on; students' prospective personal benefits and growth, extrinsic supervisor-centered factors and socio-environmental factors with which students interact on a daily basis. Further, the study also revealed that students perceived the role of their supervisors to motivate them towards learning and completion of doctoral studies as critical. This role is achieved through the supervisors' positive attitude, availability and willingness to guide the supervisees, effective mentorship of students in a friendly but professional manner that can foster health relationships between the supervisors and supervisees. Therefore, achieving learning consistency as well as motivation to work towards completion of doctoral studies is a collaborative responsibility between students, supervisors and significant others in the bigger learning environment.

6. Recommendations

From the study, the following recommendations emerged; first, students should work towards their own motivation to realize their goals. Second, there is need to boost factors that could enhance supervisor-centered motivation such as availability and prompt feedback. Third, it is critical to create a conducive socio-environment that could encourage and motivate learners. Fourth, administratively, universities should work towards reducing supervisors' workload to an acceptable ratio and attractively compensate them as a way of encouraging and motivating them as well. At the national level, the government of Kenya through the Commission for University Education (CUE), should formulate and strictly promote implementation of guidelines and policies that could govern post-graduate studies in a standardized manner across the country to ensure quality control in postgraduate, especially doctoral studies.

7. References

i. Abiddin, N. Z. (2012). Postgraduate students' perception on effective supervision: a case study at one public university in Malaysia. International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education (IJCDSE), *3*(1), pp. 635-639.
ii. Abiddin, N. Z. & West, M. (2007). Supervision practices for foreign graduate research students. American journal ofapplied sciences, 4(6), pp. 362-370.
iii. Amutabi, M. N. (2011). Kenyan students blame professors for delays in studies. African Interdisciplinary Studies Association Website
iv. Amutabi, M. N. (2011). Why Kenyans take forever to acquire PhDs. Daily Nation Newspaper, Tuesday, April 2011.
v. Bair, C. R & Haworth, J. G. (1999). Doctoral student attrition and persistence: A meta-synthesis of research. Association forthe study of Higher Education Annual Meeting Paper.
vi. Bair, C. R.; Haworth, J. G. & Sandfort, M. (2004). Doctoral student learning and development: A shared responsibility. A journal of student affairs research and practice, 41(4), pp. 7-20.

vii. Burgess, H, & Wellington, J. (2010). Exploring the impact of the professional doctorate on students' professional practice and personal development: Early indications. Open University, University of Sheffield, Work Based Learning e journal, 1(1), pp. 160-176.

viii. Blundell, R., Deanden, L., Meghir, C. & Sianesi, B. (1999). Human capita investment: The returns from education and training to the individual, the firm and the economy. Fiscal studies 20(1), pp. 1-23. ISSN 1475-5890.

ix. Brailsford, I. (2010). Motives and aspirations for doctoral study: career, personal and interpersonal factors in the decision to embark on History PhD. Auckland, New Zealand: Center for academic development, University of Auckland. International journal of doctoral studies, 5(2), pp. 15-27.

x. Cardona, J. J. (2013). *Determined to Succeed: Motivation towards doctoral degree completion*. Dissertation submitted inpartial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of doctor of Philosophy in The University of Michigan.

xi. Cassuto, L. (2013). PhD attrition: How much is too much? A disturbing 50 percent of doctoral students leave graduate school without finishing. The Chronicle of Higher Education.

xii. Cullen, D. J., Pearson, M., Sala, L. J., & Spear, R. H. (1994). *Establishing effective PhD supervision.* Canberra: Higher Education Division, Australia Government Publishing Service.

xiii. Charikleia, T. (2014). The wider budget of PhD. University World News: Global window for Higher Education.Issue No. 315.

xiv. Chen, L H. (2013). Gratitude and adolescent athletes' well-being: The multiple mediating roles of perceived socialsupport from coaches and teammates. Social Indicators Research 114(2), pp. 273-285.

xv. Chen, L H. & Wu, C.H. (2014). Gratitude enhances athletes' self-esteem: The moderating role of trust coach. Journal of applied sports psychology 26(3), pp. 349-362.

xvi. Dillon, Robin S. (Ed.). (2016). *"Respect",* The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Edward N. Zalta URL = https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/respect/

xvii. Farkas, D. (2014). Is your doctorate degree a good investment of your time and money? www.FinishYourthesis.com

xviii. Gallagher, E. (2013). *Effects of teacher-student relationships: Social and academic outcomes of low income middle and highschool students.* New York: NYU Steinhardt-Applied Psychology.

xix. Gardner, S.K. (2008). What is too much and what is too little? the process of becoming an independent researcher in doctoraleducation. Journal of Higher Education, 79, pp. 326-350.

xx. Golde, C.M. (1998). *Beginning graduate school: Explaining first year attrition.* In M.S. Anderson (Ed.), the experience ofbeing in graduate school: An exploration. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

xxi. Golde, C.M. (2000). Should I stay or should I go? Student description of doctoral attrition process. Review of Higher Education, 23(2), pp. 199-227.

xxii. Gudo, C.O., Olel, A. M. & Oanda, I. O. (2011). University expansion in Kenya and issues of quality education: Challenges and opportunities. International journal of business and social sciences, 2(20), pp. 203-214.

xxiii. Haksever, A. M. & Manisali, E. (2000). Assessing supervision requirements of Ph.D students: the case of construction management and engineering in the UK. Euro J Engin Educ. 25(1): pp.19-32.

xxiv. Hendrie, W. (2007). *The power of positive criticism*. New York: American Management Association.

xxv. Hockey J. (1996). Strategies and tactics in the supervision of UK social science Ph.D students. Qualit Stud Educ; 9(4), pp.481-500.

xxvi. Isaak, D. J. & Hubert, W. A. (1999). Catalyzing the transition from student to scientist- a model for graduate research training. Oxford University Press Journal career Network. BioScience 49(4), pp. 321-326. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/1313615

xxvii. Kirsi, P., Auli, T., Stubb, J., & Kirsti L. (2012) The Challenges of Becoming a Scholar: A Study of Doctoral Students'Problems and Well-Being. International Scholarly Research Network. ISRN Education, Volume 2012, Article ID934941, 12 pages doi:10.5402/2012/934941.

xxviii. Kurtz-Costes, B.; Helmke, L. A. & Ulkusteiner, B. (2006). Gender and doctoral studies: the perceptions of Ph.D. students in an American University. Gender and Education, 18 (2), pp. 137–155.

xxix. Muchiri, A. K, Tanui, K.E, & Kalai, M. J. (2016). Quality of academic resources and students' satisfaction in public universities in Kenya. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Education Research, 15(10), pp. 130-146.

xxx. Naveed, A. (2015). Think tanks and universities-Different yet similar: The south and Asian context. https://onthinktanks.org/

xxxi. Nganga, G. (2013). Far-reaching reforms as new universities law is enacted. University World News, June, 12.

xxxii. Niemiec, R. M. (2014). *Mindfulness and character strengths: A practical guide to flourishing.* Cambridge, MA: Hogrefe.

xxxiii. Nolen, S., & Ward, C. J. (2008). Sociocultural and situative approaches to studying motivation. In M. Maehr, S. Karabenick,& T. Urdan (Eds.), Social psychological perspective on motivation and achievement (Advances in motivation andachievement, 15, pp. 425–460). London: Emerald.

xxxiv. Sanlair, M. (2011). The pedagogy of good PhD supervision: A national cross-disciplinary investigation of PhD supervision. International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 1(1), pp. 15-29.

xxxv. The commission of University Education (2014). *Harmonized university Guidelines.* Nairobi: CUE.

xxxvi.   The economist (2010). The disposable academic: Why doing PhD of often a wasteof
         time.https://www.economist.com/node.17723223
xxxvii. Kiley, M. (2009). Identifying threshold concepts and proposing strategies to support doctoral candidates. Innovations
         in Education and Teaching International, 46(3), pp. 293–304.
xxxviii. Piccinin, S. J. (2000). Graduate student supervision: resources for supervisors and students. Triannual newsletter,
         Centre for development of teaching and learning (CDTL). CDTLink: Canada, University of Ottawa.
xxxix.   Phillips, E. M. & Pugh, D. S. (2000). *How to get a Ph. D - a handbook for students and their supervisors.*
         Buckingham:Open University Press.
xl.   Wachira, K. (2011). Africa experiences PhD shortage. Standard
         digital.https://www.standardmedia.co.ke/business/article/2000037163/africa-experiences-phd-shortage
xli.   Wentzel, K. R. (1999). Social-motivational processes and interpersonal relationships: Implications for understanding
         motivation at school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91(1), pp. 76–97.
xlii.   Zimmerman, B. and Schunk, D. (Ed.), (2007). Motivation an essential dimension of self-regulated learning: *Theory,
         research and applications*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
xliii.   Zhao, C. M.,Golde, C. M. & McCormick, A. C. (2007). More than a signature: How advisor choice and advisor behavior
         affect doctoral student satisfaction. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 31(3), pp. 263–281.