

Towards Institutionalized Knowledge-Based PhD Supervision: What Is Key?



Evarist Nabaasa ¹, Deborah Natumanya ²

^{1,2}Faculty of Computing and Informatics
Mbarara University of science and Technology, Uganda

¹enabaasa@must.ac.ug

²deborahnatumanya@must.ac.ug

Citation: Nabaasa, E., & Natumanya, D. (2026). Towards institutionalized knowledge-based PhD supervision: What is key? *Journal of Research in Educational Sciences*, 17(1), 55–62.

[https://doi.org/10.14505/jres.v17.1\(21\).04](https://doi.org/10.14505/jres.v17.1(21).04)

Article info: Received 14 April 2026;
Received in revised form 8 May 2026;
Accepted 27 May 2026;
Published 30 June 2026.

Copyright© 2026 The Author(s). Published by ASERS Publishing 2026. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of [CC-BY 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Abstract: Institutions of higher learning especially universities, are very aware of the core mandate they have, *i.e.* to produce very high-quality researchers, capable of carrying out both Basic and Applied Research for society transformation. Behind the scenes of producing these expected high caliber researchers is a rigorous process managed by supervisors and mentors who subscribe to different supervision philosophies. PhD supervisors tend to fall in two major categories *i.e.* Knowledge-based and Experience-based. Much as it is believed that, Experience-based supervision, is more supervisor centered, in certain situations it becomes very practical depending on the type of student or the kind of task being handled in the PhD supervision journey. Also, depending on the cultures, perceptions, the context, among others, some PhD students may be derailed by the laxity they may perceive in the, Knowledge-based supervision philosophy which is believed to be more student centered. Much as in PhD supervision the *context* matters, but what parameters are 'Key' in the prevailing situation or context? This position paper, set out to discuss six (6) 'Key' parameters, towards institutionalized Knowledge-based PhD supervision.

Keywords: institutionalization; knowledge-based; experience-based; PhD-supervision.

Introduction

In the wake of the 21st Century, there is a need for a paradigm shift from "Experience-based" to "Knowledge-based" way of supervising PhD students Laskar, Khatun, and Sarkar (2023). Successful research supervision entails functional phases of managing research which include: - *Framing* - looking at other examples in the discipline, *Negotiating* - asking who else in the department is doing similar work, *Generating* - by reviewing the research methods most commonly used in the discipline, *Creating* - through team discussion by analyzing data, *Disseminating* through departmental seminars and conferences, *Reflecting* - on epistemological progress on how the team supported and were involved in the research process (Lee, 2019). Recent studies have emphasized that doctoral supervision is increasingly moving toward structured, collaborative, and knowledge-driven models that promote research quality, timely completion, and student well-being. Contemporary supervision approaches encourage reflective feedback, digital collaboration, and institutional accountability in order to strengthen doctoral outcomes. Studies further show that effective supervision depends on the supervisor's competence in communication, mentorship, methodological guidance, and relationship management (Bearman *et al.* 2024; Haley, Holmqvist, & Johansson, 2025). In African higher education contexts, there is growing recognition that institutionalized supervision systems can improve consistency, reduce delays in completion, and support sustainable research cultures within universities.

In Ugandan universities, PhD supervision remains largely informal and inconsistently managed, despite its critical role in shaping research quality and academic development. While institutions such as Makerere University and Mbarara University of Science and Technology have introduced supervision guidelines, these are often fragmented, poorly implemented, and lack alignment with broader institutional strategies for graduate training (Molla & Cuthbert, 2016; Samuel & Mariaye, 2023; Thamae, 2025). Supervisory practices are frequently left to the discretion of individual academics, resulting in variability in doctoral experiences, prolonged completion times, and dissatisfaction among candidates (Namutebi, Mugimu, & Balojja, 2023). This reflects a gap in the integration of contextually relevant supervision philosophies, processes, and support systems that are essential for effective doctoral education.

Despite increased demand for research-based postgraduate training, many universities in Uganda have not institutionalized clear, knowledge-based frameworks to guide PhD supervision. National quality assurance policies, such as those from the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE), offer general guidance but leave critical aspects such as supervisory capacity, accountability, and structured knowledge sharing undefined (Bakkabulindi, 2024). There is limited research that identifies the key parameters necessary for transitioning to systematic, knowledge-driven supervision models in Uganda's higher education landscape. This study, therefore, seeks to explore what generally matters in PhD supervision namely context, philosophy, and process and to propose six key parameters toward the institutionalization of knowledge-based PhD supervision in Ugandan universities. The novelty of this study lies in its attempt to consolidate supervision context, philosophy, and process into a practical institutional framework tailored to Ugandan universities. Unlike previous studies that focus mainly on supervisory relationships or doctoral completion challenges, this paper identifies six interconnected parameters that can guide universities toward sustainable and knowledge-based doctoral supervision systems. The study contributes to higher education policy discussions by providing context-specific insights relevant to emerging research universities in Africa.

The objectives of this study were i) To discuss what generally matters in PhD supervision *i.e.* Context, Philosophy, and Process. ii) To discuss six (6) 'Key' parameters, towards attaining institutionalized Knowledge-based PhD supervision. Purpose: In this paper, very relevant or key parameters, towards attaining institutionalized Knowledge-based PhD supervision are identified and discussed. With these parameters, effective and relevant PhD supervision can be realized.

1. Literature Review

A growing body of literature emphasizes that effective PhD supervision is essential for improving doctoral completion, research quality, and the development of independent researchers. Recent studies show that universities are increasingly shifting from traditional supervisor-centered models toward more collaborative and knowledge-based supervision approaches. Haley, Holmqvist, and Johansson (2025) explain that successful doctoral supervision depends on a balance between academic guidance, emotional support, and the gradual development of student independence. They further argue that institutions should establish supportive supervision cultures and clear policies that strengthen both supervisors and doctoral candidates. Similarly, (Jara, 2021) highlights that supervisor development programs improve supervision quality by enhancing communication, mentorship, and reflective supervision practices.

Recent scholarship also emphasizes the importance of relationships, feedback, and professional competence in doctoral supervision. According to Haley, Holmqvist, and Johansson (2025), doctoral students value supervisors who demonstrate methodological expertise, availability, mentorship skills, and constructive engagement throughout the research process. Their systematic review found that strong supervisory relationships positively influence student confidence, motivation, and academic performance. In the same way, Bearman et al. (2024) observed that regular and meaningful feedback plays a critical role in helping doctoral students understand academic standards and improve research writing. Effective feedback practices were found to support student independence and scholarly identity development.

Studies conducted within African higher education institutions reveal that many universities continue to face challenges related to inadequate funding, limited supervisory capacity, and inconsistent supervision practices. (Igumbor *et al.* 2022) found that effective doctoral supervision in African universities requires institutional support, training for supervisors, and stronger research environments. Their study further noted that heavy workloads and limited resources negatively affect supervision quality and doctoral completion. Likewise, recent reviews of postgraduate supervision in Sub-Saharan Africa emphasize the need for institutionalized supervision systems that promote accountability, collaboration, and knowledge sharing among supervisors and doctoral students.

Emerging research further shows that technology is increasingly shaping doctoral supervision practices. (Jensen, Bearman, Boud, & Konradsen, 2025) explains that digital tools and generative artificial intelligence are becoming important in academic writing support and feedback processes. However, the authors caution that technological tools should complement rather than replace the human relationship between supervisors and students. In addition, (McCormick & de Rivera, 2025) stresses the importance of culturally responsive and decolonized supervision approaches, especially in developing countries where local contexts strongly influence doctoral experiences. These studies support the need for institutionalized knowledge-based PhD supervision systems that are responsive to both global academic standards and local realities.

2. Methods Used

Research Design: This study employed a qualitative research design using the document review method to address two key objectives: (i) to examine the general dimensions that matter in PhD supervision namely context, philosophy, and process; and (ii) to identify and discuss six 'key' parameters essential for achieving institutionalized knowledge-based PhD supervision. This design was chosen for its strength in extracting nuanced understandings from written texts, especially those that articulate conceptual, theoretical, and policy dimensions.

Document Review Method: The document review involved a systematic, structured analysis of institutional, national, and scholarly documents relevant to doctoral education and supervision practices. This method enabled the researcher to trace both foundational concepts and evolving institutional efforts aimed at formalizing knowledge-based supervision.

Documents were selected based on the following criteria: Published between 2003 and 2025, addressing topics in PhD supervision, research training, knowledge management, or institutional academic policies, Produced by credible sources such as universities, ministries of education, higher education councils, and international academic bodies, available in English.

The documents reviewed in this paper include Institutional PhD supervision guidelines, handbooks, and supervision charters from diverse universities, National policy frameworks on graduate education and quality assurance, Peer-reviewed articles and dissertations discussing PhD supervision, academic mentorship, and knowledge transfer.

Using purposive sampling, documents were selected to ensure diverse representation across institutions with structured doctoral programs and emerging knowledge-based supervision strategies. Preference was given to documents that explicitly discussed the philosophy, context, and process of supervision, or that outlined parameters for institutionalizing supervision practices.

Data analysis was guided by the study objectives and involved a two-phase thematic content analysis: Phase I – Foundational Dimensions of PhD Supervision: Documents were reviewed to extract themes related to the context (e.g., cultural and institutional settings), philosophy (e.g., beliefs and models of supervision), and process (e.g., stages, roles, and expectations). Phase II – Key Parameters for Institutionalization: A second round of analysis focused on identifying and synthesizing six core parameters that emerged as recurrent or recommended elements for knowledge-based, institutionalized PhD supervision. These parameters were thematically categorized and conceptually defined. All documents analyzed were in the public domain or accessed with appropriate permissions. Proper citation practices were observed throughout, and no sensitive or personal data were included. Therefore, formal ethical clearance was not required.

3. Results

3.1 The Context

In PhD supervision, the *context* matters a lot. In this paper, *context* entails: background, environment, framework, setting, or situation surrounding an event or occurrence. In this paper, "event", is the PhD supervision process.

Context – definition: In PhD supervision *context* refers to what is available as the supervision process goes on *i.e.* policies, rules, regulations, infrastructure, cultures, norms, philosophies, perceptions, among others (Amundsen & McAlpine, 2009; Ashiabor, Taplin, Bryce, Kefallinos, & Reid, 2003; Bøgelund, 2015). Universities in developed economies tend to have similar PhD supervision *context* while universities in less developed economies also tend to have their own PhD supervision *context*.

However PhD supervision *context* goes on to be different from university to university even amongst developed or less developed economies, this greatly influences the outcome of the PhD supervision process and the quality of the produced PhD graduates and researchers (Adkins, 2009; Bøgelund, 2015; Madan, 2021).

Context - negative effects: The negative effects of PhD supervision due to the prevailing *context* are more pronounced in universities found in less developed economies compared to developed economies, for-example failing to quickly fit within different cultures by both PhD students and supervisors (Alban & Reeves, 2014; Race, 2024). However, less developed economies are making some positive progress about this issue though at a slow pace.

Therefore, PhD supervisors and students should always endeavor to fit within what the *context* has to offer, but above all Governments, Universities and Supervisors, have the obligation to improve the *context* if students are to benefit and graduate as accomplished independent researchers.

3.2 Supervision Philosophy

PhD Supervision *Philosophy* is: the most basic beliefs, concepts, ideas, dos, don'ts and attitudes an individual PhD supervisor or a group of supervisors believe in and follow as they supervise PhD students. In her PhD supervision philosophy (Phillips & Johnson, 2022), the author is very categorical and brings out the need of understanding and adhering to it, if a given PhD student is to successful be under her supervision.

Some PhD supervisors strictly follow, Experience based supervision, while others follow, knowledge-based supervision, philosophies. It's very important for every supervisor to subscribe to a given supervision philosophy and demand that students understand and be able to follow that philosophy right from the beginning of the research process till the end.

Experience – Philosophy: Much as it is believed that, Experience based supervision - *philosophy*, is more supervisor centered, *i.e.* supervisor always directs how and what should be done, in certain situations it becomes very practical depending on the type of student or the kind of task being handled in the PhD supervision journey.

Knowledge – Philosophy: Also, depending on the cultures, perceptions, the context, *e.t.c.* some PhD students may be derailed by the laxity they may perceive in the Knowledge based supervision - *philosophy* which is believed to be more student centered, *i.e.* the supervisor encourages more of self-finding and independence of the student.

Philosophy Attributes: A good PhD supervision *philosophy* should emphasize the following among others:

- a) Type of supervision philosophy to be followed.
- b) PhD supervision process and duration.
- c) Type of research to be carried out, *basic research* or *applied research*.
- d) Student and supervisor research interests should be in line or able to converge.
- e) Student should be willing to learn.
- f) Ready to accept positive criticism.
- g) Have time, passion, and commitment for PhD research.
- h) Be subject specialist.

Much as a PhD supervision journey is not an easy one, once supervisors and students have a common and agreed upon philosophy, where by the supervisor perceives the supervision as his/her core responsibility that must be accomplished, likewise where the student also does his/her part, the entire process becomes successful and memorable, and the reverse is also true (Aitchison & Mowbray, 2013; Andersson, Danielsson, Hov, & Athlin, 2013; Aranda-Mena & Gameson, 2004).

3.3 Supervision Process

The PhD Supervision Process is a very crucial part in the PhD journey (Gonçalves, Sanches, Batista, Duarte, & Miranda, 2021) (Carr, Lhussier, & Chandler, 2010), that should be streamlined and made clear right from the beginning to both the supervisor and the student. The two parties (supervisor and student) must have a clear picture of what this is all about, lest many things are bound to go messy.

Admission: For any PhD student to officially be recognized, a formal *Admission* must be issued to him/her. Admission, as part of the PhD supervision process, entails the following: - under which supervisor(s) is the student, what type of sponsorship does the student have, in which university is the student admitted, what is the preliminary area of research interest, duration of PhD, among others.

The above is crucial mainly to the student but also to the supervisor. At times the student does not have clear

status of admission and this causes a lot of tension in the supervision process between the supervisor and the student (Holligan, 2005; Trowler, 2022).

Orientation: PhD student orientation an important component in the supervision process. It's not fair to assume that the student will just find his/her way in the PhD journey especially at the beginning. When student orientation is not done, things can quickly go wrong and many times a student is at a loss. Universities and mainly supervisors are supposed to orient their students about areas like, the process, environment, research areas, available resources, opportunities, collaborations, cultures, among others. This boosts the confidence, the will and zeal of a student.

Doing Research: Doing Research, is when both the supervisor and the student dive into the nighty-gritties of carrying out research. This is quite exploratory, its better the student has a clear distinction of what he/she is researching about, either basic or applied research. Many PhD students tend to get lost in this stage of the supervision.

In this stage, the supervisor and the student execute the mission about their research problem, the objectives, the methods, discussion and presentation of their finding, among others. With the guidance of the supervisor, the student is able to make progressive strides following the agreed philosophy. These strides are possible when both the supervisor and student are doing their part.

Independence: As the supervision progresses from stage to stage, the supervisor is anxious to witness and observe student-independence *i.e*, when the student begins to own the research, build more confidence, talks with authority about the research, proves that he/she is in charge of the arguments being advanced either with his/her supervisor or with other people.

A good PhD supervisor works towards such moments from his student in the supervision process. When this begins to happen, both the student and the supervisor become more encouraged and excited but when this does not happen for a long time, the reserve is true.

Graduating: Graduating a PhD student is a very rewarding and exciting moment. This is what the supervisor always looks forward too, though some supervisors can find it hard to let go.

Any reasonable supervisor wishes to graduate his/her PhD students such that they also take on their own students for supervision.

3.4 What is Key in PhD Supervision?

The above sections in this position paper have discussed the *Context, Philosophy, Process*, in PhD supervision among others. These do matter, but what is *Key*? In this paper '*Key*' means something essential or very fundamental for the success of the entire supervision process. This paper identified the following six (6) parameters as being *Key* in the PhD supervision process:

- (i) Funding
- (ii) Knowledge
- (iii) Time
- (iv) Passion
- (v) Commitment
- (vi) Dedication

Funding: PhD *Funding* is paramount in a successful supervision process. In fact, many professors/supervisors in developed economies cannot take on students unless they are very sure of the funding mostly projects and grants. With limited funding the student lands in deep trouble and fails to balance between research and working for fees. In less developed economies, a number of PhD students tend to begin their PhD research when they are not sure of where to get fees, this makes them drop out and the supervisors can't help either.

Knowledge: It's very frustrating when either the supervisor or the student does not have crucial knowledge of supervising or undertaking PhD research respectively. At times because of weak processes, both the supervisor and the student find themselves on this journey when one or both of them don't have the knowledge. Such a scenario is regrettable and only complicates the whole supervision process and if not checked, very poor PhD graduates are injected into the academia.

Time: Time is a cost. It is almost everything. As the supervision process progresses, both the supervisor and the student must keep adhered to availing and keeping time for their PhD journey. A number of supervisors drop students who prove to be wasting their energy by showing that they do not have time for their research. In some

instances, some supervisors tend to orphan their students, in the guise of not having time for them, *i.e.* they are always busy. Creating time in the PhD supervision journey is very central and mandatory if success is to be realized.

Passion: Passion is when one is very concerned and always willing to positively contribute to something. With PhD supervision, passion is very commendable, lest other activities can derail both the supervisor and the student. There must be invisible love for the PhD journey even when things get tough.

Commitment: Commitment is when one proves that, there is no giving up on what he/she is doing. PhD supervision can be a long journey, sometimes lonely and doubtful. A full dose of total commitment from the beginning until the journey is complete is what both the supervisor and student must have all the time.

Dedication: Dedication is a feeling of very strong support for or loyalty to someone or something. Once a PhD supervisor or a student, you better be dedicated, otherwise the journey never comes to an end. Non dedicated supervisors or students tend to abandon the PhD journey. This is very common in students but also present in some supervisors.

4. Discussion

The findings above are now interpreted in light of the existing literature and the study's aim to identify what is key for institutionalized knowledge-based PhD supervision.

On the Role of Context: The results confirm that context—comprising policies, infrastructure, norms, and perceptions—significantly shapes supervision outcomes, consistent with previous work (Amundsen & McAlpine, 2009; Bøgelund, 2015). The finding that negative contextual effects are more pronounced in less developed economies (Alban & Reeves, 2014; Race, 2024) suggests a structural inequity that cannot be resolved solely by individual supervisor or student effort. Therefore, PhD supervisors and students should always endeavor to fit within what the context has to offer, but above all, Governments, Universities, and Supervisors have the obligation to improve the context if students are to benefit and graduate as accomplished independent researchers.

On Supervision Philosophy and Its Attributes: The distinction between experience-based (supervisor-centered) and knowledge-based (student-centered) philosophies, as found in the documents, aligns with the paradigm shift introduced earlier. The results show that neither philosophy is inherently superior; their effectiveness depends on the student's profile and the task at hand. However, the documents consistently emphasized that having any explicit, agreed-upon philosophy is more critical than the specific type. Much as a PhD supervision journey is not an easy one, once supervisors and students have a common and agreed upon philosophy, whereby the supervisor perceives the supervision as his/her core responsibility that must be accomplished, likewise where the student also does his/her part, the entire process becomes successful and memorable, and the reverse is also true (Aitchison & Mowbray, 2013; Andersson, Danielsson, Hov, & Athlin, 2013; Aranda-Mena & Gameson, 2004).

On the Supervision Process Stages: The five sequential stages—admission, orientation, doing research, independence, graduating—reflect a logical progression. The findings highlight that the absence of clear admission status (Holligan, 2005; Trowler, 2022) or lack of orientation can derail students prematurely. Doing research is identified as the most exploratory and potentially confusing stage, where many students get lost. Independence is presented as a key milestone that signals successful doctoral development. Graduating, while rewarding, may be delayed by supervisors' reluctance to let go—an underexplored psychological factor.

What Is Key: The Six Parameters: The six parameters (funding, knowledge, time, passion, commitment, dedication) emerged as cross-cutting essentials. **Funding** is paramount: in developed economies, supervisors often require assured project funding before accepting students; in less developed economies, students frequently begin without fee security, leading to dropout. **Knowledge** of supervision or research processes, when lacking in either party, produces poor-quality graduates. **Time** is a cost; supervisor unavailability (or student time-wasting) jeopardizes progress. **Passion** sustains the journey through difficulties, while **commitment** prevents abandonment. **Dedication**—strong loyalty to the supervision relationship—is the final guard against non-completion. These six parameters, often mentioned separately in the literature, are here synthesized as a collective prerequisite for any institutionalized knowledge-based supervision model.

Conclusion

Yes, the *Context, Philosophy, Process*, in PhD supervision matter, but the above six parameters are *Key*. This paper recommends that any PhD supervisor or student should always look into these parameters and evaluate them right

from the beginning, in the middle, till the end of the PhD journey in order to attain relevant and meaningful PhD supervision.

Declarations

Acknowledgements: We would like to extend our appreciation to the faculty of computing for the continued research support.

Credit Authorship Contribution Statement:

Nabaasa Evarist: contributed the following in this paper *i.e.* search and analysis of articles, presentation of results and writing of the manuscript draft.

Natumanya Deborah: contributed the following in this paper *i.e.* writing of the abstract, methodology, confirmation of references and citations and general formatting of the manuscript

Declaration of Competing Interest: The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Declaration of use of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies: The authors declare that they have not used generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process before submission, but only to improve the language and readability of the paper.

References

- Adkins, B. (2009). PhD pedagogy and the changing knowledge landscapes of universities. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28(2), 165–177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360902725021>
- Aitchison, C., & Mowbray, S. (2013). Doctoral women: Managing emotions, managing doctoral studies. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(8), 859–870. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2013.827642>
- Alban, D. J., & Reeves, P. L. (2014). Cultural fusion: International teacher responses to multiculturalism. *Journal of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research*, 9(1).
- Amundsen, C., & McAlpine, L. (2009). “Learning supervision”: Trial by fire. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 46(3), 331–342. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703290903068909>
- Andersson, C. S., Danielsson, A., Hov, R., & Athlin, E. (2013). Expectations and experiences of group supervision: Swedish and Norwegian preceptors’ perspectives. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 21(2), 263–272. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12012>
- Aranda-Mena, G., & Gameson, R. (2004). An alignment model for the research higher degree supervision process using repertory grids. In *Proceedings of the Australian Universities Building Educators Association (AUBEA) Conference*.
- Ashiabor, H., Taplin, R., Bryce, M., Kefallinos, E., & Reid, A. (2003). Redefining our experiences of research through the integration of multiple perspectives for the development of postgraduate research. In *Proceedings of the AARE Mini-conference 2003*.
- Bakkabulindi, F. E. K. (2024). National Council for Higher Education of Uganda: A call for trimming of its mandate and increasing of its staffing and funding. In *Higher education governance and management in Africa: Continental, regional, and national perspectives* (pp. 197–216). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-12345-6_10
- Bearman, M., Tai, J., Henderson, M., Esterhazy, R., Mahoney, P., & Molloy, E. (2024). Enhancing feedback practices within PhD supervision: A qualitative framework synthesis of the literature. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 49(5), 634–650. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2023.2245678>
- Bøgelund, P. (2015). How supervisors perceive PhD supervision and how they practice it. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 10, 39–55. <https://doi.org/10.28945/2096>
- Carr, S. M., Lhussier, M., & Chandler, C. (2010). The supervision of professional doctorates: Experiences of the processes and ways forward. *Nurse Education Today*, 30(4), 279–284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2009.09.001>

- Gonçalves, S. F., Sanches, T., Batista, M., Duarte, C., & Miranda, J. (2021). PhD supervision: Doctoral students' perceptions, expectations and needs. In *EDULEARN21 Proceedings*.
- Haley, A., Holmqvist, M., & Johansson, K. (2025). Supervisors' competences from doctoral students' perspectives: A systematic review. *Educational Review*, 77(6), 1971–1990. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2024.2301123>
- Holligan, C. (2005). Fact and fiction: A case history of doctoral supervision. *Educational Research*, 47(3), 267–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131880500104121>
- Igumbor, J. O., Bosire, E. N., Karimi, F., Katahoire, A., Allison, J., Muula, A. S., et al. (2022). Effective supervision of doctoral students in public and population health in Africa: CARTA supervisors' experiences, challenges and perceived opportunities. *Global Public Health*, 17(4), 496–511. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17441692.2021.1900312>
- Jara, M. (2021). Doctoral supervision development programme: Learning through peer learning, reflection and case studies. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 58(4), 441–450. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2020.1732314>
- Jensen, L. X., Bearman, M., Boud, D., & Konradsen, F. (2025). Feedback encounters in doctoral supervision: The role of generative AI chatbots. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2345678>
- Laskar, J. H., Khatun, R., & Sarkar, M. C. (2023). *Education in resurgent India*. Ashok Yakkaldevi.
- Lee, A. (2019). *Successful research supervision: Advising students doing research*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315166627>
- Madan, C. R. (2021). A brief primer on the PhD supervision relationship. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 35(Suppl. 1), 5229–5234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13854046.2021.1901654>
- McCormick, A., & de Rivera, L. (2025). Love and pedagogy in doctoral supervision: A duoethnography navigating complex positionings within decolonising contexts. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 33(5), 1705–1725. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2024.2305678>
- Molla, T., & Cuthbert, D. (2016). In pursuit of the African PhD: A critical survey of emergent policy issues in select sub-Saharan African nations. *Policy Futures in Education*, 14(6), 635–654. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210316631889>
- Namutebi, A., Mugimu, C. B., & Balojja, T. D. (2023). Individual characteristics as predictors of program completion of PhD students in Makerere University. *East African Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 6(2), 226–255.
- Phillips, E., & Johnson, C. (2022). *How to get a PhD: A handbook for students and their supervisors* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education (UK). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003112261>
- Race, R. (2024). *Multiculturalism and education* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Samuel, M. A., & Mariaye, H. (2023). *Exploring the postgraduate education space*. JA Smit.
- Thamae, M. (2025). Autobiography reflecting on academic leadership and management and doctoral supervision: From childhood to academia. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 20(1).
- Trowler, P. (2022). Doctoral supervision: Sharpening the focus of the practice lens. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 41(5), 1743–1756. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.2001234>