Investigating Dissertation Supervisors' Characteristics Valued by Supervisees and their Effect on the Supervision Process

Bekki Chaima, Bouchama-Sari Ahmed Fizya

Investigating Dissertation Supervisors' Characteristics Valued by Supervisees and their Effect on the Supervision Process

Bekki Chaima [a*] iD, Bouchama-Sari Ahmed Fizya [a] iD

ª Algiers 2University, LIRADDI laboratory, 02 Djamel Eddine El Afghani, Bouzareah, Algeria

Corresponding author: chaima.bekki@univ-alger2.dz

Abstract	
Keywords: supervision process, supervisor' characteristics, supervisees' preference, supervisor selection	The Supervision process requires both supervisors and supervisees to perceive supervisors' qualities as a determining criterion in the selection of supervisors. In order to investigate supervisors' characteristics valued by supervisees and their effect on the supervision process in the English department at the University of Tiaret, two questionnaires were handed to 40 Master 2 Didactic students and 10 teachers selected through purposive sampling The data generated were subject to quantitative and qualitative analysis. The findings revealed that supervisees appreciate supportive, flexible, responsive, available and knowledgeable supervisors. Results also suggested that directive, demanding, unresponsive and inaccessible supervisors are not appreciated. Further, it was found that lack of clear guidelines on how to choose a good supervisor, lack of awareness of the roles of supervisors and supervisees and obliviousness of supervisors' contribution to supervisees' overall development were the principal reasons causing challenges in finding a suitable supervisor. The findings also showed that supervisors' selected characteristics enhance supervision by creating an inclusive and productive environment that reaches intended outcomes efficiently. Considering these results, the following pedagogical implications are offered. The study argues for organizing seminars to inform (future) supervisees of characteristics of good supervisors and how to choose a suitable one, cultivating a positive relationship between supervisors and supervisees by clarifying the roles of each, scheduling meetings between supervisors and supervisees to create a code of conduct for working together on long terms, regulating guidelines for supervisor selection and tailoring supervisory programs that prioritize the characteristics identified in this research.

Zusammenfasung	
Schlüsselworte: Betreuungsprozess, Eigenschaften vom Betreuer, Betreuten-Vorzüge, Vorgesetzter Auswahl	Der Überwachungsprozess erfordert sowohl von den Aufsichtspersonen als auch von den Betreuten, die Qualitäten der Aufsichtspersonen als entscheidendes Kriterium bei der Auswahl wahrzunehmen. Um die van den Betreuten geschätzten Eigenschaften der Aufsichtspersonen und deren Auswirkungen auf den Überwachungsprozess am Fachbereich Englisch an der Universität von Tiaret zu untersuchen, wurden zwei Fragebögen an 40 Master-2-Didaktikstudierende und 10 Lehrkräfte im Rahmen einer gezielten Stichprobenauswahl verteilt. Die generierten Daten wurden quantitativ und qualitativ analysiert. Die Ergebnisse zeigten, dass die Betreuten unterstützende, flexible, reaktionsfähige, verfügbare und sachkundige Aufsichtspersonen schätzen. Die Ergebnisse legten auch nahe, dass aufsichtsführende, fordernde, unreaktive und unzugängliche Aufsichtspersonen nicht geschätzt werden. Darüber hinaus wurde festgestellt, dass mangelnde klare Richtlinien zur Auswahl einer guten Aufsichtsperson, mangelndes Bewusstsein für die Rollen von Aufsichtspersonen und Betreuten sowie Unkenntnis des Beitrags von Aufsichtspersonen zur Gesamtentwicklung der Betreuten die Hauptgründe für Schwierigkeiten bei der Suche nach einer geeigneten Aufsichtsperson sind. Die Ergebnisse zeigten auch, dass die ausgewählten Eigenschaften der Aufsichtspersonen die Überwachung verbessern, indem sie eine inklusive und produktive Umgebung schaffen, die die beabsichtigten Ergebnisse effizient erreicht. Angesichts dieser Ergebnisse werden folgende pädagogische Implikationen angeboten. Die Studie plädiert für die Organisation von Seminaren, um (zukünftige) Betreute über die Eigenschaften guter Aufsichtspersonen und deren Auswahl zu informieren, eine positive Beziehung zwischen Aufsichtspersonen und Betreuten durch Klärung der Rollen jeder Partei zu fördern, Treffen zwischen Aufsichtspersonen und Betreuten zu planen, um einen Verhaltenskodex für die langfristige Zusammenarbeit zu erstellen, Richtlinien für die Auswahl von Aufsichtspersonen festzulegen und Betreuungsprogramme zu gestalten, die die in dieser Forschung identifizierten Eigenschaften priorisieren.

1. Introduction

According to Marsh et al. (2002), research is a process that it considered a pre-requisite constituent of higher education that can only occur under the direction of a supervisor. Dissertation supervisors are considered as indispensable agents in all the stages of the supervision process. Hence, it is significant that supervisees select the suitable supervisor for themselves. This is a process that depends on their perceptions of an appreciated supervisor. This often results in a situation where some supervisors are

requested by many supervisees while others end up with few or no supervisees.

In the English Department at Ibn Khaldoun University of Tiaret, supervisors used to be chosen by supervisees. However, in recent years, only half of students who were ranked at the top were offered the privilege to choose their own supervisor while the administration assigned supervisors to the other half of students who obtained lower results. The rationale behind this internal policy is to ensure that workload is equitably distributed across supervisors. Naturally, students who were assigned their supervisor expressed a general discontent and dissatisfaction against this process of supervisors' repartition that they perceived as totally unfair since they had little or no say. Top students, on the other hand, tackled the challenge of selecting the adequate supervisor being aware that this choice will likely have a positive or a negative impact on the quality of the supervision process and its outcomes. Acker et al. (1994) argue that supervisees experience trepidation regarding their aptitude for this task because of a variety of reasons including lack of communication with supervisors, solitude in case problems arise during the supervision process and not receiving feedback regarding their progress. Being in contact with Master 2 students in the aforementioned department allowed to easily conduct some informal interviews with supervisees and supervisors to get a preliminary idea about their perspectives concerning what supervisees they look for in a supervisor.

This aroused the need to explore the perceptions of supervisees' and supervisors about supervisees most appreciated traits in supervisors and to scrutinize the influence of these characteristics on the supervision process from the perspective of students and teachers. Accordingly, this study seeks to provide answers to the two following research questions:

RQ1: What characteristics Master supervisees expect to find in their supervisors?

RQ2: How are these characteristics expected to affect the supervision process?

To answer the research questions, the following hypotheses are generated:

RH1: Master supervisees expect their supervisors to be available, supportive and expert.

RH2: These characteristics are expected to have an enhancing effect on the supervision process.

This investigation is significant as it aims to provide valuable insights into the complex dynamics of supervisory relationships. From a theoretical standpoint, it expands the existing literature and knowledge base on dissertation supervisors' most appreciated traits; more specifically supervisors' characteristics sought by Master supervisees through an in-depth investigation of students' and teachers' perspectives. Our study seeks to raise students' and teachers', awareness of the attributes of a successful supervision and provide them with insights into the effects that these characteristics might produce on the supervision process. It is hoped that the findings of this study will contribute in informing the development of interventions aimed at enhancing supervisory skills. It also expands to selection criteria for individuals entering supervisory roles. Higher education institutions and stakeholders can use the study's results to improve overall quality of supervision. Last but not least, by identifying the effects that these characteristics might produce on the supervision process, this investigation aspires to have significant implications for Didactics Master's students and their supervisors to improve the supervisory experience.

2. Theoretical background

According to Al-Muallem et al. (2016), supervision is an intricate multifaceted process. This signifies that supervision encompasses various stages and aspects that collectively shape it. Sambrook et al. (2008) aver that the essence of supervision lies in its function to guide and support supervisees. Van Rensburg et al. (2016) argue that this process requires two parties: a supervisor and a supervisee who acquire knowledge and evolve jointly while Ismail et al. (2011) and Zaaba et al. (2015) expand on this idea affirming that these two parties target the same objective. In its essence, this process epitomizes a collaborative endeavour grounded in a journey of mutual growth and knowledge accumulation striving towards a shared provision. Besides, Van Rensburg et al. (2016) state that research supervision aims at transmitting supervisors' research and related skills to their supervisees. Therefore, Wisker (2005) considers research supervision as a transformation process supervisees undergo from being first time researchers into becoming autonomous researchers. That is, this dynamic exchange of knowledge marks the birth of a new pedagogical relationship. Supervisees need to gradually reveal and come to terms with the new pedagogical contract which is established within the supervisor-supervisee pair.

A huge body of literature including Moskvicheva et al. (2015), McAlpine (2013), Taylor and Frsa (2016)

and Wolff (2010) attest that supervisees need supervisors in all stages of the supervision process from choosing a suitable research topic till refining the final version of the dissertation. Another group of researchers namely Lekalakala- Mokgele (2008), Severinsson (2015), Sidhu et al. (2014) and Chikte and Chabilall (2016) affirm that supervisees need also their supervisor's support in establishing a professional relationship between the supervisor and the supervisee. Expecting supervisors to actively participate in all supervision phases denotes the recognition of their contribution to the overall process. For Lee (2009) and Thompson et al. (2005), supervisors are required to be accessible and ready to help when necessary. Supervisors are required to be easy to reach and ready to help. Abiddin et al. (2011) see supervisors responsible for gaining access to relevant sources while researchers like Sidhu et al. (2013), Moskvicheva et al. (2015) and Mehrani (2017) believe that supervisors are needed to assess supervisees through constructive feedback. In addition to all the above mentioned researchers, Severinsson (2015) and Eley and Murray (2009) suggest that supervisors are expected also to schedule regular and purposeful supervision sessions, to plan and design attainable objectives and even to prepare for viva voice.

Speaking about supervisors' role, Assakrane (2016) confirms that teachers perform multidimensional roles. Researchers like Hockey (1994), Ismail et al. (2013) and Rademeyer (1994) consider the supervisor as responsible for finishing the supervision process successfully. Al-Torkhi (2011) highlights that supervisors are also teachers, administrative members an researchers simultaneously. Heath (2002) sees the supervisor as responsible for offering expertise, support and time to supervisees and guiding them for a supervision process that adheres to acceptable standards while Doğan and Bıkmaz (2015) believe that supervisors are critical agents in supervisees' cognitive, emotional and professional development. Other researchers namely Phillips and Pugh (2000) and Frischer and Larsson (2000) believe that effective supervisors are expected to possess a proven record of research publications showcasing a significant contribution to their field of research. Yeatman (1995) argue also for a track record of supervising a considerable number of students. Furthermore, Abiddin (2007b) believe that the supervisor is expected to possess leadership qualities and counselling aptitude while researchers like Wisker (2007), Tahir et al. (2012), Talebloo and Baki (2013)

and Easterby-Smith et al. (2002) believe that supervisors need to demonstrate readiness to assist supervisees and proficiency in providing feedback that is constructive. On the same line of thoughts, Seagram et al. (1998) argue that the supervision process in positively influenced by supervisors who express a positive attitude towards it. This implies the need for versatility and adeptness in multitasking to fulfil the mandate of active participation.

An extensive body of research including Holbrook et al. (2014), Alam et al. (2013), Stubb et al. (2012) and Meyer (2007) accentuate the perplexity between supervisors and supervisees in defining, on the one hand, the responsibilities and roles of each. Tahir et al. (2012), Latona and Browne (2001) and Shariff et al. (2014) explored, on the other hand, the confusion in meeting research supervisees' expectations of the qualities of the supervisor throughout the process of supervision. Evidence from research undertaken by Tahir et al. (2012) and Talebloo and Baki (2013) suggests that ambiguity and divergence between supervisors' practices and supervisees' expectations can lead to challenges in the supervisory relationship. Claudius and Vincent (2017) argue that research has uncovered intriguing findings that elevate the relationship between supervisees and supervisors as pivotal in enhancing good supervisory outcomes. The authors advocate the establishment of 'work alliance' between supervisors and supervisees at the outset of the process. Furthermore, Tahir et al. (2012), Shariff et al. (2014), Murphy et al. (2007) and Bair and Haworth (2004) agree with them and call for establishing a collaborative relationship.

From a similar viewpoint, Wright (2003), Meissner (2012), Latona and Browne (2001) and Peterson (2007) classify the relationship between the supervisor and supervisees as a crucial determinant of the supervision quality. Thompson et al. (2005) and Polonsky and Waller (2014) call for the urge of communicating a comprehensive distinction between the roles of each in order to build a supervisory relationship that is productive and healthy. Conversely, if there is a mismatch between supervisees' expectations of the supervisor characteristics and his real characteristics, quality of the supervision process is at risk. Any bewilderment often leads to incomplete or delayed degrees (Malfroy, 2005) and the formation of unfavourable educational experiences for students (Manathunga, 2012; Guerin & Green, 2015; Taylor & Frsa, 2016; Lahenius & Ikavalko, 2014).

Hockey (1996) listed the following characteristics for effective supervisors: empathy, respect, honesty, genuineness and flexibility. According to Chikte and Chabilall (2016), a supervisor embodies devotement, forbearance, zeal, approachability, positive attitude and constructive criticism. Ali et al. (2016) added to the abovementioned qualities encouraging autonomy and enhancing supervisees' time management skills. From a close standpoint, Sidhu et al. (2014) and Calma (2007) suggest that supervisors should be well versed in the field of the study whereas Polonsky and Waller (2014) advocate being expert in the topic of research, in methodology, in the research process and in boosting motivation (Sidhu et al., 2014). Mainhard et al. (2009) emphasised that supervisors are expected to possess a set of qualities, including understanding and caring, being attentive, encouraging discussions about the topic of research when appropriate and providing feedback and support (Ribau, 2020). Cekiso et al. (2019) advocate that effective qualities are essential not only for supervisors, but also for supervisees, both play equally important and influential roles. Fan et al. (2018) assert that when these characteristics are possessed by both parties, they yield reciprocal reliance and understanding and foster an environment conductive to research.

On the same line of thoughts, Denicolo (2004), in his study, examined supervisees' favourable traits in a supervisor and found out that they prefer supervisors who are knowledgeable, encouraging, dependable and informative. Ghani et al. (2012) through their study suggest that supervisees select supervisors who exhibit qualities such as friendliness, approachability, flexibility and resourcefulness. Abiddin and West's (2007a) empirical study about the traits of an effective supervisor underscores the importance of supervisors embodying qualities like active engagement, competence and knowledge. The supervisor needs to be a researcher who can analyze and improve supervisee's research practice through personalized ongoing reflection and professional development. On the contrary, Frischer and Larsson's (2000) investigation revealed that supervisors characterised by the lack of timely, frequent and appropriate guidance proved unfavoured. Burns et al. (2016) emphasized the multifaceted role of the supervisor in providing both technical expertise and emotional support. Based on this, supervisors need to be attentive in balancing their personality traits in dealing with supervisees as learners and supervisor skills in responding to supervisees as novice researchers. They must cultivate a personal positive demeanour on the one hand and demonstrate expertise in the research topic and research.

Research has explored also the effect of supervisors' characteristics on supervisees' completion of research works. According to Ellison and Dedrick (2008) and Eyangu et al. (2014) supervisors' supervisory characteristics affect students' completion of their dissertation as well as their future career choices. Tahir et al. (2012), Akparep et al. (2017) and Ali et al. (2019) emphasize the significance of supervisory practices in ensuring successful completion of dissertations, thereby effective supervision practices contribute to the advancement of knowledge and academic achievement. The study of Latona and Browne (2001) provides valuable insights on the significance of effective supervision that plays a significant role in achieving successful academic outcomes. Shariff et al. (2014) elaborate on the previous ideas by delving into the multidimensional dynamics of supervision highlighting how it influences various aspects of research including methodology, data interpretation and manuscript preparation. Other researchers namely Ndayambaje (2018), Motseke (2016), Kimani (2014) see effective supervision as a unique pedagogical process that results in timely academic research completion. To reduce attrition, improve the rate of degree completion and maintain general and stable satisfaction levels, honesty is a must (Al-Muallem et al., 2016).These studies contribute to a deeper understanding of the effect of dissertation supervisors' traits on research.

Despite the availability of the aforementioned literature on supervisors as determinant agents in the supervision process, the studies did not take into account both supervisees' and supervisors' perspective about their preferred criteria in selecting supervisors. Moreover, studies carried out by researchers as Denicolo (2004), Ghani et al. (2012), Abiddin and West's (2007a) and Burns et al. (2016) dealt with the characteristics that supervisees look for in their supervisors but lacked clear guidelines on how to evaluate a supervisor before selection. Ellison and Dedrick (2008), Eyangu et al. (2014), Tahir et al. (2012), Akparep et al. (2017) and Ali et al. (2019), Latona and Browne (2001), Shariff et al. (2014), Ndayambaje (2018), Kimani (2014) explored effective supervision which results in the completion of research works from students' perspective only, they did not compare supervisees' and supervisors' points of view. Furthermore, only a few researchers such as Denicolo (2004), Abiddin (2007b) and Ghani et al.

(2012) dealt with the topic under investigation at PhD level in different departments, however; preferences of supervisees regarding their supervisors at PhD level differ from preferences of supervisees at Master level. This variation stems from the demands; developmental stages of each level and experience in undertaking research, i.e., Master supervisees are first time researchers who need a broader range of characteristics from supervisors compared to their PhD counterparts.

In the Algerian context, be it a case in point, the majority of studies investigated supervisors' impact on the supervision process pace and perceptions of the supervision process. Based on our current knowledge, no study explored supervisors' valued characteristics by supervisees from the perspective of both supervisees and supervisors. The paucity of available literature prompted our scholarly interest in this topic thereby directing our attention towards exploring supervisors' valued characteristics by supervisees at Tiaret University from the perspective of both supervisees and supervisors. Hence, our study aims to serve as a guiding resource for Algerian researchers, by extension researchers in general, embarking on similar or related inquiries.

3. Research methodology

In order to meet the objectives of the research, a descriptive exploratory study was conducted with 40 Master 2 students and 10 teachers enrolled in the English department at Ibn Khaldoun University. The study was carried out at the end of the first semester of the academic year 2023/2024 after students finished their studies and the supervision had process actually started.

3.1. Participants and sampling procedures

The participants (both supervisees and supervisors) were selected according to purposive sampling procedures. We believe that the most appropriate type of sampling is the purposeful/ purposive sampling as we deliberately selected only supervisees who selected their supervisors and supervisors who were voluntarily selected by supervisees. That is, the supervisees were selected to take part in this research based on the researchers' personal judgment as whether the participants could best describe the situation, provide researchers with rich and reliable information, and help them better understand the problem under discussion.

Before selecting the participants, the researchers clearly defined the specific characteristic, based on the research objectives, which is supervisees' personal selection of supervisors. The participants must meet this criterion (to select and being selected) to be eligible for inclusion in the study. Once the criterion was identified, the researchers referred to the administration to reach out to these participants

Therefore, the questionnaire was handed only to supervisees who were given the opportunity to choose their supervisor and to supervisors who were selected by supervisees. Supervisees who did not choose their supervisors and supervisors who were not selected by supervisees and who were dispatched by the administration according to specific criteria did not serve the purpose of this study. Sampling continued until data saturation was reached. After including 40 students and 10 teachers, gathering additional data from other participants ceased to provide new insights. This saturation indicates that the collected data is sufficiently comprehensive to address the research questions and objectives.

Purposive sampling facilitated the inclusion of participants who meet this specific criterion of interest. Although this kind of sampling, which excludes participants who do not meet the criterion, may inadequately represent the diversity of perspectives of our target population; its pragmatic advantages in terms of accessibility and efficiency justifies its use.

3.2. Data collection instruments and procedures

To reach answers to the research queries, two questionnaires were designed for gathering and triangulating data to elicit respondents' specific answers. The students' questionnaire contains 09 questions divided on three sections (see appendix A) while the teachers' questionnaire contains 10 questions divided on three sections (see appendix B). Two questions included in the students' questionnaire (Q 06 and 07) in addition to two questions in the teachers' questionnaire (Q 07 and 08) are adapted from two prominent measurement means which are the Supervision Styles Inventory (SSI) and the Supervisory Relationship Questionnaire (SRQ).

3.2.1. Description of the teachers' questionnaire

Section 01 is entitled 'general information about supervisees'. It contains two questions related to gender and age distribution respectively. Though the data obtained from these two questions do not serve any research purposes (i.e., they are irrelevant to our research), we included them as warming up (or

opening) questions to encourage the respondents' participation in the study.

Section 02 entitled 'finding your dissertation supervisor' contains 03 questions (Q3,4 and 5). Question 03 aims at discovering whether the students encountered difficulties/challenges in finding a supervisor and at scrutinising the nature of these challenges if any. Question 04 seeks to know if supervisees were aware about the characteristics they value in supervisors when they started to look for their supervisor while question 05 seeks to find out whether students were informed about and taught how to choose a supervisor during their undergraduate studies.

Section 03 entitled 'characteristics of a good supervisor' comprises 04 questions (Q 6,7,8 and 9). Question 06 attempts to uncover the qualities/characteristics supervisees focus on in choosing a supervisor. The items of this question are adapted from SSI which was designed by Friedlander et al. (1984). The authentic version included 27 items; however, only 18 items are included in an attempt to serve the purpose of this study. This question is complemented by a follow up question which requires respondents to specify other qualities/characteristics that are not mentioned among the options. Question 07 focuses on identifying the qualities/characteristics supervisees seek to find in their supervisor. The categories and statements of this question are adapted from SRQ which was developed by Palomo et al. (2010) and comprises six components:

The safe base is the first constituent. It describes a cooperative supervisory setting where supervisees comfortably exchange viewpoints with the supervisor who is expected to be receptive and responsive to their needs.

Structure is the second constituent. It addresses practical boundaries established and maintained by supervisors in terms of structure, organization and timing of the supervisory meetings.

The third component is commitment. It is related to the supervisor's interest and commitment to the supervision task, not perceiving supervisees as a burden.

Reflective education makes up the forth element. In this component, the supervisor is supposed to simplify the use of theory in practical situations.

Role models are the fifth constituent. Supervisors are seen as highly credible, experts with exceptional knowledge and integrity.

Formative feedback is the final component. It involves supervisors providing timely and relevant input on the research of their supervisees on a regular basis.

The original version of the questionnaire consists of 67 items. However, for the sake of practicality, only 23 items were used to design our questionnaire. The modifications on the items of these two questions were applied to suit the participants, to ensure that these items are understood and accurately reflect characteristics/qualities supervisees value in a supervisor. Question 08 is meant to decipher the impact of traits of supervisors on the supervision process from supervisees' point of view and question 09 aims at exploring the qualities/characteristics of supervisors, which are not appreciated by supervisees.

3.2.2. Description of the teachers' questionnaire

The supervisors' questionnaire examined similar aspects covered in the students' questionnaire with slight variation. The purpose behind addressing the same points in both questionnaires is to double check the findings and validates them by investigating the topic under research from bipartite perspectives (supervisees vs. supervisors). Cross-checking serves as a crucial technique in assuring the validity and reliability of the results.

Section 01 is entitled 'general information about supervisors'. It contains 04 questions. Q01 is related to participants gender, it does not serve any research purposes (i.e., it is irrelevant to our research), we included it as a warming up (or opening) question to encourage the respondents' participation in the study. Q02, 03 and 04 aim at obtaining information regarding teachers' professional background (academic degree, year of experience and training in dissertation supervision respectively) in order to investigate their readiness to be supervisors.

Section 02 entitled 'finding a dissertation supervisor' contains 02 questions (Q05 and 06). Question 05 aims at discovering whether students were informed about and taught how to choose a supervisor during their undergraduate studies. The aim of question 06 is to discover whether the students encountered difficulties/challenges in finding a supervisor and at scrutinising the nature of these challenges if any.

Section 03 entitled 'characteristics of a good supervisor' comprises 04 questions. Q07 attempts to uncover the qualities/characteristics supervisees focus on in choosing a supervisor. This question is

complemented by a follow up question which requires respondents to specify other qualities/characteristics that are not mentioned among the options. Question 08 focuses on identifying the qualities/characteristics supervisees seek to find in their supervisor. These two questions are identical to Q06 and 07 in the students' questionnaire; they pertain to the same models (SSI and SRQ respectively) and underwent the same adaptation process. The sole difference lies in their derivation from supervisors' perspective.

Following their design, the questionnaires were piloted with five supervisees and three supervisors who participated in the study afterwards. Respondents offered feedback about the questionnaires relating to their length and comprehensibility. The researchers used this input to refine the questionnaires by shortening their length, reformulating some statements and adding follow-up questions.

Then the questionnaires were reviewed by two experienced researchers to ascertain their face and content validity. To guarantee the content validity of our instruments, we meticulously tried to assess the relevance of their content to the objectives of the study and the review of literature before administering the final version.

For face validity, we deliberated on the questionnaires layout, length and response formats for some items with reference to the feedback received from the consulted researchers. Additionally, the pilot study also contributed to establishing face validity. Both questionnaires tackled the same questions to ensure concurrent validity.

Before administering the questionnaires to the participants, they were sent a consent form (See Appendix C). The latter was designed to incite respondents' participation while ensuring a clear understanding of the research aims, data collection methods and procedures and agreement on participation conditions. Additionally, they were informed that their responses would be analyzed and interpreted by the researchers only. The consent also assures anonymity and confidentiality of data which would be used solely for research purposes.

3.3. Data Analysis procedures

In the present study, quantitative data obtained from close ended questions were analysed through the use of statistical descriptive analysis. Supervisees' and supervisors' responses were classified and underwent conversion either to percentages or means. Descriptive analysis was conducted to summarize the participants' responses to each item.

Responses to open-ended questions, on the other hand, were subject to content analysis. They were thematically organized depending on their common key concepts. Finding connections between data sets is the main goal of the process. After determining the thematic categories in each questionnaire, themes found in the teachers' questionnaire were compared to those found in the students' questionnaire to determine whether the experiences and assertions made in relation to the phenomenon being discussed are unique to individual cases or shared by all respondents (i.e., supervisors and supervisees). This comparison between data aims at strengthening the findings' validity by cross-checking them to detect similarities and discrepancies.

4. Results

4.1. Students' questionnaire
Section 01: General information about the supervisee
Q1: Specify your gender
Q2: Specify your age group

Table1. Age and gender distribution of participants

Age group / Gender	20 - 25	26 - 30	31 – 35	+ 36	Total percentage
Males	10	03	00	02	37%
Females	16	01	02	06	63%
Total percentage	65%	10%	5 %	20 %	100 %

As reveals the Table 1, the group of participants of this study is not balanced in terms of gender distribution as there is a dominance of females (63%) over males (37%).   The average age of most participants (65%) ranges between 20 and 25 years while four students' ages are between 26 and 30 years, two students' ages are between 31 and 35 and eight students are more than 36 years old. As a reminder, the two previous questions about age and gender were just included as warming-up questions and did not serve any of our research objectives.

Section 02: Finding a supervisor

Q3: Did you have any idea about the desirable characteristics of a supervisor before you started looking for your own supervisor?

The majority of respondents (85%) attested that they had formed an idea about the

characteristics/qualities of supervisors they want to work with. They unanimously mentioned that they look for knowledgeable, collaborative, available, flexible and kind supervisors. From a similar stand point, 20% want strict and prescriptive supervisors, 5% look for a permissive supervisor and two informants (5%) highlighted generation gap and search for a supervisor belonging to 'gen Z'. These respondents prefer supervisors who were born in the 1990s and raised in the 2000s during the most significant technological transformations in the century in order to avoid generation gap between the two. The rest of the participants (15%) reported that they did not know what to look for in a supervisor.

Q4: During your undergraduate studies, were you informed about the procedure to choose a good supervisor?

The participants reported unanimously (100%) that during their studies they were not informed about the procedure of choosing a good supervisor. Therefore, no one (0%) answered the follow-up question 'If yes, how did it help?'

Q5: Did you meet any challenges/difficulties in finding a dissertation supervisor?

The results reveal that most participants (77%) did not face any problem in finding a supervisor while the rest of the respondents (23%) confirmed that they did. All the participants belonging to this category attributed the difficulty of finding a supervisor to their themes; they argued that the supervisors rejected them because of their research topics. One student stated that the supervisor refused to supervise him because of the low mark the student got in the module taught by that supervisor.

Section 03: Characteristics of a good supervisor

Q6: What qualities/ characteristics did you accentuate in choosing your supervisor?

Table 2. Supervisors' characteristics/ qualities focused on by supervisees

Qualities/ characteristics (%)					
Goal oriented	**40%**	Focused	**35%**	Demanding	**15%**
Perceptive	**20%**	Creative	**15%**	Evaluative	**35%**
Committed	**70%**	Supportive	**70%**	Friendly	**60%**
Practical	**20%**	Resourceful	**35%**	Responsive	**40%**
Intuitive	**15%**	Thorough	**15%**	Prescriptive	**05%**
Reflective	**15%**	Didactic	**35%**	Flexible	**60%**

As shows the Table 2, the majority of participants (70%) emphasize that their supervisors need to be committed and supportive. More than half of the respondents (60%) accentuate on being friendly and flexible. Less than half of the students involved in the study (40%) stress goal orientation and responsiveness as qualities they look for. Additionally, 35% of the informants want supervisors who are focused, resourceful, didactic and evaluative. Perceptive and practical supervisors' traits are highlighted by 20% of the sample. Furthermore, only few (15%) esteem intuitive, reflective, creative, thorough and demanding supervisors whereas only two supervisees (5%) esteem prescriptive supervisors. No respondent (0%) suggested any additional traits in the follow up question.

Q7: Tick the statements that match your opinion most closely.

With reference to safety base, all participants (100%) reported that they appreciate supervisors who respect their person and ideas, collaborate rather than prescribe, and provide constructive criticism without judging them. Only few participants (15%) value supervisors who listen to supervisees openly. No participant (0%) showed appreciation to supervisors who ensure supervisees' feeling of safety. In terms of structure, all supervisees (100%) esteem supervisors who are organized and plan regular meetings whereas no one (0%) showed discontent towards interrupting /cutting short supervision sessions. For commitment traits, participants unanimously (100%) admire supervisors who are enthusiastic about supervision, approachable and easy to talk to, available and easy to reach and do not make supervisees feel like a burden. With reference to reflective education, most appreciated supervisors according to the participants are those who have a command of theoretical knowledge, half of the respondents (50%) want supervisors to pay attention to unspoken anxieties and feelings. No one of the supervisees involved in the study (0%) appreciate supervisors who incite them to reflect upon their practice. With reference role model traits, all participants (100%) appreciate supervisors who are knowledgeable in the topic of research, provide practical solutions and have respect among colleagues and administration staff. With reference to formative feedback, 80% of respondents reported that they appreciate supervisors who provide regular feedback on their performance, 35% esteem supervisors who balance positive and negative feedback and 5% value supervisors who help them identify their needs. No respondents (0%) reported admiration to supervisors who pay attention to their level of competence.

Q8: In your opinion, how would the characteristics you selected affect the supervision process?

All respondents provided different answers pertaining all to the same idea. They strongly believe that the supervisors' selected characteristics play a vital role in maintaining a good relationship with supervisees, creating an encouraging, orderly, respectful and productive supervising environment and reaching intended outcomes efficiently. To illustrate, some of the students' answers are quoted as follows:

▪ "Having a supervisor with these characteristics would help establishing a good and constructive supervisory relationship and prevent wasting time in problems and misunderstanding...."

▪ "... there will be no constraints at the level of communication nor the research work, order and organization are ensured and supervision goes smoothly..."

▪ "These characteristics would strengthen the sense of cooperation and collaboration which boosts motivation also and eventually supervision sessions will be fruitful."

▪ ".... supervision would not be exhausting nor mentally draining, it would rather be encouraging and effective."

▪ "It makes supervision smooth and the work will finish within time limits..."

▪ " ..... these would facilitate the work, keep us engaged and steady, make us gain time and effort and put us in a respectful atmosphere..."

Q9: Are there any traits you do not appreciate in a dissertation supervisor?

The results show that all participants (100%) shared with us the characteristics that they do not appreciate in their supervisors. 90% of respondents do not appreciate supervisors who are too directive, demanding, lack responsiveness, not motivated, do not provide enough feedback, cannot be reached easily, procrastinate supervision sessions or corrections . Some respondents (30%) do not esteem supervisors who suddenly decide to change the topic of research because they lack the necessary knowledge/skills related to it. Few informants (5%) reported that they do not value supervisors who are disobliging and without clear rationale/justifications.

4.2. Teachers' questionnaire

Section 01: General information about the supervisor

Q1: Specify your gender

The group of participants of this study is not balanced in terms of gender distribution as there is a dominance of females (70%) over males (30%). As a reminder, this question about age was included as warming-up question only and did not serve any of our research objectives.

Q2: Specify your academic degree

Q3: Specify the duration of your experience in dissertation supervision

Table 3. Supervisors' academic degree and duration of supervisory experience

Years ⟋ Diploma	01 - 05	06 - 10	11 – 15	+ 16	Total percentage
PhD	02	03	02	01	80%
Magister	00	02	00	00	20%
Total percentage	20%	50%	20%	10%	100%

As shows the Table 3, the majority of participants (80%) are PhD holders while only (20%) hold a Magister diploma and are already enrolled in PhD studies. It is worth mentioning that none of them (0%) holds another academic degree. For years of supervisory experience, 02 PhD holders (20%) are novice supervisors with less than 05 years of experience, precisely 04 years. Half of the participants' (50%) supervision experience ranges between 06 and 10 years, among the 03 are PhD holders and 02 hold a Magister degree. One PhD holder (10%) has more than 16 years of experience in dissertation supervision. Since the participants' supervision experience ranges from 04 to more than 16 years, they can provide reliable data required for answering the research questions and reaching the objectives of the study.

Q4: Did you benefit from any training in dissertation supervision?

Despite the importance of training in assisting supervisors in developing an informed approach to supervise Master students, the participants unanimously asserted (100%) that they did not benefit from any training in dissertation supervision. Their

supervision is guided by their personal experience as former students and/or by their readings on the topic.

Section 02: Finding a dissertation supervisor

Q5: Are students informed about the procedure to choose a good supervisor during their undergraduate studies?

The participants reported unanimously (100%) that, during undergraduate studies, students are not informed about the procedure of choosing a good supervisor. Therefore, no one (0%) answered the follow-up question 'If yes, how did it help?' However, all participants (100%) answered the other follow up question and suggested a set of characteristics which they perceive as important to be a good supervisor. Precisely, all participants (100%) believe that it is important for a supervisor to be domain and research expert, effective communicator, adaptable, accountable, patient and decision maker. Other characteristics mentioned by the majority of respondents (70%) include being evaluative, practical and resilient. (20%) perceive organization, integrity and motivation to be among the most important characteristics that should be possessed by supervisors.

Q6: Do you think supervisees meet challenges/difficulties in finding a dissertation supervisor?

The results reveal that half of the participants (50%) attest that students do not meet any difficulties in finding a supervisor while the other half (50%) confirmed that supervisees face challenges in finding a supervisor. The respondents of this category attributed the difficulties to specialization mismatch and workload constraints which are generally discarded by supervisees when choosing a supervisor. One respondent only (10%) relate the difficulty in finding a supervisor to teachers' biases against certain students either for personal, behavioural or students level-related reasons.

Section 03: Characteristics of a good supervisor

Q7: In your opinion, what qualities/ characteristics do your students accentuate in choosing their supervisor? (You may tick more than one option)

As shows the Table 4, the majority of teachers (80%) agree upon the fact that supervisees in their search for a supervisor focus on traits like commitment, support, resourcefulness, friendliness, responsiveness and flexibility. Less than half of the respondents (40%) reported that supervisees appreciate supervisors who are thorough and goal-oriented. Furthermore, only a few respondents (30%) consider that students esteem perceptive, intuitive and practical supervisors. (20%) of teachers believe that supervisees value supervisors who are reflective and creative while no one (00%) believe that demanding and prescriptive teachers are valued by supervisees. One respondent considers that supervisees value focused, didactic and evaluative supervisors. No respondent (0%) suggested any additional traits in the follow up question.

Table 4. Supervisors' characteristics/ qualities focused on by supervisees from supervisors' perspective

Qualities/ characteristics (%)					
Goal oriented	**40%**	Focused	**10%**	Demanding	**00%**
Perceptive	**30%**	Creative	**20%**	Evaluative	**10 %**
Committed	**80%**	Supportive	**80%**	Friendly	**80%**
Practical	**30%**	Resourceful	**80%**	Responsive	**80%**
Intuitive	**30%**	Thorough	**40%**	Prescriptive	**00%**
Reflective	**20%**	Didactic	**10%**	Flexible	**80%**

Q8: Tick the statements that match your opinion most closely. (You may tick more than one option)

With reference to safety base, all participants (100%) reported that supervisees appreciate supervisors who respect their person and ideas, collaborate rather than prescribe, and provide constructive criticism without judging them, who listen to them openly and who ensure supervisees' feeling of safety. In terms of structure, all teachers (100%) believe that students esteem supervisors who are organized and plan regular meetings, who do not interrupt/cut short supervision sessions. For commitment traits, participants unanimously (100%) reported that supervisees admire supervisors who are enthusiastic about supervision, approachable and easy to talk to, available and easy to reach and do not make supervisees feel like a burden. With reference to reflective education, most appreciated supervisors according to the participants are those who have a command of theoretical knowledge and who pay attention to unspoken anxieties and feelings. No one of the supervisors involved in the study (0%) believe that supervisees appreciate supervisors who incite them to reflect upon their practice. With reference to role model traits, all participants (100%) think that supervisors who are knowledgeable in the topic of research, provide practical solutions and have respect among colleagues and administration staff are most appreciated. With reference to formative

feedback, all respondents (100%) do not believe that supervisees appreciate supervisors who help them identify their needs and who pay attention to their level of competence. Less than half of the participants (40%) think that supervisees value supervisors who provide both positive and negative feedback.

Q9: In your opinion, how would the characteristics you selected affect the supervision process?

According to the respondents' answers, the supervisors' selected qualities of supervisors play a pivotal role in fostering a positive relationship with supervisees, establishing a supportive, orderly and productive supervising environment and achieving desired outcomes efficiently. To illustrate, some of the supervisors' answers are quoted below:

▪ "Possessing the selected qualities help supervisors maintain active engagement and satisfaction which lead to better supervision process."

▪ ".... they can prevent supervision barriers such as: mismatched expectations, communication breakdowns, conflicts and tension...."

▪ " the aforementioned characteristics help maintaining high productivity and progress in the supervision process"

▪ "....they ensure the smooth running of supervision process and make it effective and efficient...."

Q10: From your experience, what are the traits your students would not appreciate in a dissertation supervisor?

The results show that all participants shared with us, depending on their experience, the characteristics that their supervisees do not appreciate in supervisors. All respondents (100%) attest that supervisees do not appreciate supervisors who are micromanagers and too controlling and overly critical. The great majority (90%) confirm that supervisees do not value supervisors who are unapproachable, unsupportive and apathetic. Most of the participants (80%) affirm that supervisors who are inaccessible, rigorous and demanding are less preferred by supervisees.

5. Discussions

Our study focused on supervisors' traits looked for by Master's supervisees from the perspective of students and teachers. With reference to the first question of this research, the students' and teachers' questionnaires revealed similar results. The findings of

the students' questionnaire revealed that only a few students (3%) and a few supervisors (10%) reported that supervisees value essential traits as evaluation, resourcefulness and being didactic while the majority of students (70%) and teachers (80%) confirmed supervisees' focus on some qualities such as commitment, responsiveness, flexibility and kindness neglecting other crucial characteristics like perception, creativity and reflection. These findings are in accordance with the studies of Polonsky and Waller (2014), Calma (2007), Ghani et al. (2012), Abiddin (2007b), Abiddin and West's (2007a), Denicolo (2004) and Sidhu et al. (2014). This implies that supervisees lack awareness regarding other important characteristics that make a good supervisor including focus on growth, reflection, motivation and practicality. This can be attributed to supervisees' lack of awareness and prior knowledge of the most important criteria in choosing a supervisor. Providing a clear set of criteria or guidelines that guide supervisees in choosing their supervisors can be an effective solution to overcome supervisees' subjectivity in their choice. This absence of awareness may also cause a potential disconnect between the expectations of supervisees and the qualities exhibited by supervisors. This reveals that supervisees did not develop a comprehensive understanding of the attributes that contribute to a successful supervision.

Furthermore, relying on supervisees' answers to question 7, and supervisors' answers to question 8, supervisees do not seem to be disturbed by interruption in sessions, and do not value supervisors who either pay attention to their competence nor incite them to reflect on their practice. Hence, it would be acceptable for supervisees that supervisors cancel supervision sessions, but not to be asked to critically think of their competence and practice. This indicates supervisees' misconceptions of their supervisors' roles and responsibilities as well as their own. This accords the results of the studies undertaken by Holbrook et al. (2014), Alam et al. (2013), Stubb et al. (2012), Meyer (2007), Tahir et al. (2012) and Talebloo and Baki (2013) which report supervisees' confusion in defining supervisors and supervisees' roles. Besides, supervisees' indifference towards supervision sessions which constitute the sole opportunity in which supervisors and supervisees can meet is prevailing. This reveals the absence of a thorough and holistic understanding of the importance of supervisory sessions as a requirement of the supervision process and highlights the need to fulfil it. This finding is in accordance with the conclusions Thompson et al.

(2005), Malfroy (2005) and Polonsky and Waller (2014) drew.

It can also be inferred from the results that supervisees are unaware of supervisors' contribution to their cognitive development. Relying on participants' answers, half of the students (50%) and the majority of teachers (80%) confirm that supervisees value supervisors who are supportive and who pay attention to their anxieties and unspoken feelings but all of them (100%) do not value supervisors who pay attention to their level of competence nor who incite them to reflect on their practice. This shows that students are aware of supervisors' influence on their emotional status but are unaware of their impact on their cognitive development. These results support Burns et al. (2016) findings and align with Doğan and Bıkmaz's (2015) and Sambrook et al., (2008) findings with regard to supervisors' contribution to supervisees' emotional development. Yet, our study reached opposing findings to Doğan and Bıkmaz's (2015) study concerning supervisors' contribution to supervisees' cognitive development. Moreover, it can be deduced that there is a mismatch in priorities and/or perceived needs. While supervisors may prioritize assessing and enhancing students' competence, supervisees prioritize the pragmatic completion of the research work. Similarly, there is a resistance against self-reflection from students' part. A solution to the aforementioned issues relies in raising supervisees' awareness about the qualities that make supervisors effective and informing them about supervisors' contribution to the overall development of supervisees in addition to clarifying the roles of each.

Moreover, the results of the students' and teachers' questionnaires showed that supervisees met difficulties to find a supervisor because they did not submit their request to the right supervisor who shares their specialism. Being enrolled in a Master's in Didactics, students cannot be supervised by a literature teacher for example. Supervisees value supervisors who tend to be friendly, approachable and supportive at the expense of important variables such as specialism which is a key criterion in the process. Said differently, supervisees discard the fact that they cannot be supervised by supervisors they appreciate because the latter are specialised in a major different from their specialism. This sheds light on the mismatch between what supervisees value and the constraints imposed by the specialized nature of academic expertise. Supervisees must get into a decision making process in an attempt to find a

supervisor who is appreciated and is an expert in the research area. Supervisees should not overlook the fact that their preferred supervisor may not be suitable because of his different specialism. If these two attributes are ranked according to priority, specialism will outweigh preference. This research finding cannot be discussed in relation to previous studies. Rather, our explanations relied exclusively on the participants' answers. The results of the supervisors' questionnaire elucidate that workload is also an obstacle that may hinder supervisees in their search for a supervisor; this result aligns with the findings revealed by Assakran's (2016) study. Supervisors reported that students fail to understand that supervisors are required to deal with other commitments like teaching, fulfilling administrative duties and pursuing postgraduate studies besides supervising them. These findings align with the findings of Al-Torkhi (2011).

With reference to the second question of this research which sought to explore the effect of these characteristics on the supervision process, both groups of participants are aware of the significant effect of supervisors' characteristics/qualities/traits on the supervision process. Supervisees and supervisors concede that supervisors who are committed, responsive, flexible and expert have an enhancing effect on the supervision process. This effect manifests in optimizing and enriching the quality of supervision process by fostering a constructive relationship with supervisees, nurturing a structured, productive and an inclusive supervisory context that accomplishes intended outcomes efficiently. As already noted in the results section, the findings of the study conform to the findings of Seagram et al. (1998) and Latona and Browne (2001) which are referred to in the literature review section.

Considering the results discussed in the aforementioned paragraphs, it is recommended to schedule seminars allowing supervisees and potential supervisors to meet and agree upon broad terms to verify the possibility of compatibility between the two parties on long term. It is preferable to set out clear expectations through a discussion between the supervisee and the supervisor in the early stages of the supervision process regarding their roles to avoid any mismatch in expectations.

In our investigation we sought to explore dissertation supervisors' characteristics valued by supervisees. In doing so, we formulated two main research objectives. The first objective aims at uncovering the dissertation supervisors'

characteristics that are most appreciated by supervisees. To attain this objective, we generated hypothesis 1 which proposed that Master supervisees expect their supervisors to be available, supportive and expert. This hypothesis is confirmed and supported by our findings as participants constantly reported a preference for supervisors who are accessible, supportive and approachable. Furthermore, respondents expressed their prioritization for supervisors who exhibit expertise and competence that is reflected in their responsiveness and resourcefulness.

The second objective seeks to ascertain whether there exists a significant effect of these characteristics on the supervision process. To reach this objective, we formulated hypothesis 2 which suggested that these characteristics are expected to have an enhancing effect on the supervision process. Our findings validate this hypothesis as the results demonstrated the relevance of dissertation supervisors' characteristics as perceived by supervisees in influencing positively the supervision process making it inclusive and productive. By identifying and prioritizing the aforementioned traits, the supervisory experience is enhanced and contributes to academic success.

6. Conclusions

To conclude, this study explored supervisors' characteristics that are most appreciated by graduate students in the English Department at Ibn Khaldoun University. To this end, a questionnaire was administered to supervisees. The study revealed that supervisors' characteristics that are most valued by supervisees include being committed, supportive, friendly, flexible, responsive, available, organised, enthusiastic, knowledgeable and providing constructive feedback. Supervisors who are too directive, high in demanding low in responsiveness, not motivated, who do not provide enough feedback, who cannot be reached easily, and who procrastinate supervision sessions or corrections are not preferred by supervisors.

The impact of supervisors' chosen traits is critical to upholding positive relationships with supervisees, fostering a supportive, disciplined, courteous, and productive supervision environment, and effectively achieving goals. These results and the findings of the previous studies mentioned in the literature review section are in accordance.

Lack of clear guidelines on how to choose a good supervisor and lack of awareness of roles attributed to supervisors and supervisees in addition to lack of awareness of supervisors' contribution to supervisees' overall development were the principal causes behind the challenges encountered by supervisees in finding a suitable dissertation supervisor.

Therefore, considering the results of the present investigation, the following implications, according to us, would benefit both supervisors and supervisees:

▪ Organizing seminars at the end of the 1st year Master degree or in the beginning of 2nd year to inform (future) supervisees of what makes a good supervisor and how to choose a suitable supervisor.

▪ Clarifying the roles of supervisors and supervisees. This leads to the cultivation of a more effective relationship between the two.

▪ Scheduling meetings between supervisees and potential supervisors to agree upon broad terms to confirm whether the two parties may possibly be congruent to work together on long terms.

▪ Informing policy decisions in which policy makers ensure that guidelines for supervisors' selection align with effective practices and students' success.

▪ Tailoring supervision programs that prioritize the characteristics identified in this research.

While considerable effort was invested in conducting this study and produce rigorous findings, it is important to admit that the current study, like any other survey, has a number of limitations. Despite our efforts to mitigate potential biases and methodological constraints, certain factors may have influenced the results or restricted the generalizability of our findings. Therefore, it is imperative to acknowledge these limitations and provide recommendations for a more comprehensive understanding of the scope and implications of the research.

One shortcoming is the scarce literature on our research topic which caused challenges in comparing findings of earlier studies to our research findings and discussing them. Therefore, we recommend that future research take into consideration this limitation and thoroughly delve into this crucial topic.

Another deficiency is associated with the sample who took part in our study and its limited context. This study cannot be generalized because it is limited to an exiguous size of participants at Tiaret University. Viewpoints expressed by the small number of supervisors and supervisees belonging only to Tiaret University included within the study cannot be representative of all Algerian universities, teachers

and students. Thus, there is a need to carry out further research to scrutinize the results of this study in a different setting with a larger sample of supervisees and supervisors belonging to different universities to reach conclusions that are more valid and reliable.

The last limitation is related to the focus of study. Our research concentrated solely on personality traits and competence-related qualities supervisees seek in a supervisor disregarding other pertinent characteristics such as gender, age and experience. Hence, we aspire for this exploratory study to set the groundwork for future studies to examine these attributes and analyse their effect on the supervision process.

References

Abiddin, N.Z. (2007b). Postgraduate students' perception on effective supervision: A case study at one public university in Malaysia. *The Journal of International Social Research*, *1*, 7-19.

Abiddin, N.Z., & West, M. (2007a). Effective meeting in graduate research student supervision. *Journal of Social Sciences*, *3*, 27-35.

Abiddin, N. Z., Ismail, A., & Ismail, A. (2011). Effective supervisory approach in enhancing postgraduate research studies. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *1* (2), 206–217.

Acker, S., Hill, T., & Black, E. (1994). Thesis supervision in the social sciences: Managed or negotiated. *Higher Education, 28*(4), 483-498.

Akparep, J. Y., Jengre, E., & Amoah, D. A. (2017). Demystifying the Blame Game in the Delays of Graduation of Research Students in Universities in Ghana: the Case of University for Development Studies. *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research, 5(1*), 34– 50.

Alam, F., Alam, Q., & Rasul, G. (2013). A pilot study on postgraduate supervision. *Procedia Engineering*, *56*, 875 -881. Retrieved from online at www.sciencedirect.com

Ali, P. A., Watson, R., & Dhingra, K. (2016). Postgraduate research students' and them supervisors' attitudes towards supervision. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 11*, 227-241. Retrieved from http://www.informingscience.org/Publications/3541

Ali, J., Ullah, H., Sanauddin, N. (2019). Postgraduate Research Supervision : Exploring the Lived Experience of Pakistani Postgraduate Students. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences,13(1*), 14– 25.

Authors note:

Bekki Chaima is a PhD student in the Department of English at the University of Algiers 2, Algeria. She is specialised in Didactics of Foreign Languages. Her research interests include Teacher Education Development (TED), educational psychology and teacher-learner relationship in different educational contexts.

Bouchama-Sari Ahmed Fizya is a senior lecturer in the Department of English at the University of Algiers 2, Algeria. She is specialised in applied linguistics and didactics of foreign languages. Her fields of interest are: teachers' conceptions of teaching and learning, approaches to teaching, approaches to learning, teacher professional development, assessment in the language classroom, a blended learning.

Al-Muallem, A., Elzubeir, M., Roberts, C., & Magzoub, M. (2016). Development and initial testing of an instrument for evaluating needs and inferring readiness of research supervisors: A mixed methods approach. *Health Professions Education* , *2* (2), 138–147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hpe.2016.03.001

Al-Tokhi, H. (2011). Professional development of faculty members in research supervision: A proposal. *Journal of Education Science*, *19*(4), 149-180.

Assakran, A. (2016). The developmental vision of the role of the academic supervisor of theses, dissertations, and complementary research of postgraduate students in departments of education at Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University. *Journal of Education Sciences, 6(1*), 15-76. https://doi.org/10.12816/0030297

Bair, C. R., & Haworth, J. G. (2004). Doctoral student attrition and persistence. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*. Dordrecht: Kulwer.

Burns, A., Westmacott, A., & Ferrer, A. (2016). Initiating an action research program for university EFL teachers: Early experiences and responses. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 4*(3), 55-73.

Calma, A. (2007). Postgraduate supervision in Philippines: setting the research agenda. Asia - *Pacific Education Researcher*, *16* (1), 91-100.

Cekiso, M., Tshotsho, B., Masha, R., & Saziwa, T. (2019). Supervision experiences of postgraduate research students at one South African higher education institution. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 33*(3), 8-25. https://doi.org/10.20853/33-3-2913

Chikte, U., & Chabilall, J. (2016). Exploration of supervisor and student experiences during master's studies in a Health Science Faculty. *South African Journal of Higher*, *30* (1), 57–79. Retrieved from https://journals.co.za/content/high/30/1/EJC191666

Claudius, S., & Vincent, S. (2017). Towards improving the supervision of postgraduate students in Tanzanian higher learning institutions. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 6*(2), 29–40.

Denicolo, P. (2004). Doctoral supervision of colleagues: Peeling off the veneer of satisfaction and competence. *Studies in Higher Education*, 29(6), 693–707.

Doğan, N., & Bıkmaz, Ö. (2015). Expectation of students from their thesis supervisor. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *174*, 3730–3737. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.1106

Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R., & Lowe, A. (2002). *Management research: An introduction* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publication.

Eley, A. & Murray, R. (2009). *How to Be an Effective Supervisor*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Ellison B.A. B. & Dedrick R. F. (2008). What do Doctoral Students Value in their Ideal Mentor?. *Research in Higher Education*, *39*, 455-467.

Eyangu, S., Bagire, V., & Kibrai, M. (2014). An Examination of the Completion Rate of Masters Programs at Makerere University Business School. *Creative Education, 05*(22), 1913– 1920. https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2014.522214

Fan, L., Mahmood, M., & Uddin, A. (2018). Supportive Chinese supervisor , innovative international students : a social exchange theory perspective. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 20*(1), 101-115. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-018-9572-3

Friedlander, M., & Ward, L. (1984). Development and validation of the Supervisory Styles Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *31*, 541– 557. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.31.4.541

Frischer, J., & Larsson, K. (2000). Laissez-faire in research education – An inquiry into a Swedish Doctoral Program. *Higher Education Policy*, *13*, 131-155.

Ghani, N. A., Suhaimi, E., Atek, E., & Manaf, Z. B. A. (2012). Effective Supervision from Research Students' Perspective. *International Journal of Education, 4*(2). https://doi.org/10.5296/ije.v4i2.1531

Guerin, C. & Green, I. (2015). 'They're the bosses': feedback in team supervision. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *39*(3), 320-35.

Heath, T. (2002). A quantitative analysis of PhD students' views of supervision. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *21*(1), 41– 53.

Hockey, J. (1994). Establishing boundaries: Problems and solutions in managing the PhD supervisor's role. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 24* (2), 293-305.

Hockey, J. (1996). Strategies and tactics in the supervision of UK social science PhD students. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, *9* (4), 481-500.

Holbrook, A., Shaw, K., Scevak, J., Bourke, S., Cantwell, R. & Budd, J. (2014). PhD candidate expectations: Exploring mismatch with experience. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, *9*, 329-346.

Ismail, A., Abiddin, N.Z., & Hassan, A. (2011). Improving the development of postgraduates' research and supervision. *International Education Studies*, *4* (1), p. 78-89.

Ismail, H. M., Majid, F. A., & Ismail, I. S. (2013). "It's complicated" relationship: Research students' perspective on doctoral supervision. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *90* (InCULT 2012), 165–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.07.078

Kimani, E. N. (2014). Challenges in Quality Control for Postgraduate Supervision. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education, 1*(9), 63–70. http://irlibrary.ku.ac.ke/handle/123456789/13154

Lahenius, K. & Ikavalko, H. (2014). Joint supervision practices in doctoral education – A student experience. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *38* (3), 427-66

Latona, K., & Browne, M. (2001). Factors associated with completion of research degrees. *Higher Education Series, 37,* (Canberra, Department of Education, Science and Training).

Lee, N. J. (2009). Professional doctorate supervision: Exploring student and supervisor experiences. *Nurse Education Today*, *29* (6), 641–648. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2009.02.004

Lekalakala-Mokgele, S. (2008). Expectations of postgraduate nursing students: an inquiry. *Curationis*, *31* (3), 44– 50.

Mainhard, T., Rijst, R., Tartwijk J.& Wubbels, T. (2009). A model for the supervisor–doctoral student relationship. *Higher Education*. *58*, 359-373.

Malfroy, J. (2005). Doctoral supervision, workplace research and changing pedagogic practices. *Higher Education Research and Development*, *24* (2), 165-178.

Manathunga, C. (2014). *Intellectual Postgraduate Supervision: Reimagining Time, Place and Knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Marsh, H. W., Rowe, K. J., & Martin, A. (2002). PhD students' evaluations of research supervision. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(3), 313–348.

McAlpine, L. (2013). Doctoral supervision: Not an individual but a collective institutional responsibility. *Journal for the Study of Education and Development*, *36* (3), 259-80.

Mehrani, M. (2017). A narrative study of Iranian EFL teachers' experiences of doing action research. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 5*(1), 93-112.

Meissner, B. (2012). *Examining the relationship between supervisory styles and counselor skill and personal development perceived by the supervisee* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://opensiuc.lib.siu. Edu/dissertations

Meyer, J. H. F. (2007). On the modelling of postgraduate students' perceptions of research. *Journal of Higher Education*, *21* (8), 1103-1117.

Moskvicheva, N., Bordovskaia, N., & Darinskaya, L. (2015). Role of students and supervisors' interaction in research projects: Expectations and evaluations. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* , *171* , 576–583. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.163

Motseke, M. (2016). Reasons for the slow completion of Master and Doctoral degrees by adult learners in a South African township. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning, 56*(3), 424– 441.

Murphy, N., Bain, J. D., & Conard, L. (2007). Orientation to research higher degree supervision. *Higher Education, 53*, 209-234.

Ndayambaje, I. (2018). Effect of supervision on timely completion of PhD Programme. *Rwandan Journal of Education, 4*(2), 57–70.

Palomo, M., Beinart, H. & Cooper, M. (2010). Development and validation of the Supervisory Relationship Questionnaire (SRQ) in UK trainee clinical psychologists. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *49*, 131-149.

Petersen, E. B. (2007). Negotiating academicity: Postgraduate research supervision as category boundary work. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32, 475-487.

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

Polonsky, M. J., & Waller, D. S. (2014). *Designing and Managing a Research Project* (3rd ed.). saje Publishers.

Rademeyer, G. (1994). Thesis supervision: Getting the genie out of the lamp. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *8* (2), 92-95.

Ribau, I. Doctoral supervisors and PhD students' perceptions about the supervision process in a young European university. Universal *Journal of Educational Research,* *8*(1), 36-46. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080105

Sambrook, S., Stewart, J., & Roberts, C. (2008). Doctoral supervision…A view from above, below and the middle! *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *32*, 71-84.

Seagram, B. C., Gould, J., & Pyke, W. (1998). An investigation of gender and other variables on time to completion of doctoral degrees. *Research in Higher Education*, *39*(3), 319–335

Severinsson, E. (2015). Rights and responsibilities in research supervision. *Nursing and Health Sciences* , 17 (2), 195– 200. https://doi.org/10.1111/nhs.12160

Shariff, N., Ramli, K. I., and Ahmad, R. (2014). Factors contributing to the timely completion of PhD at the Malaysian IPTA: The case of University Utara Malaysia. *Proceedings of International Conference on Postgraduate Research*, 131-141.

Sidhu, G. K., Kaur, S., Fook, C. Y., & Yunus, F. W. (2013). Postgraduate Supervision: Exploring Malaysian Students' Experiences. *Procedia –Social Behabioural Sciences*, *90* (InCULT 2012), 133–141. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.07.074

Sidhu, G. K., Kaur, S., Fook, C. Y., & Yunus, F. W. (2014). Postgraduate supervision: Comparing student perspectives from Malaysia and the United Kingdom. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 123*, 151–159. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1409

Stubb, J., Pyhalto, K. & Lonka, K. (2012). Conceptions of research: the doctoral student experience in three domains. *Studies in Higher Education*, *39* (2), 251-264.

Tahir, I. M., Ghani, N. A., Atek, E. S. E., & Manaf, Z. A. (2012). Effective supervision from research students' perspective. *International Journal of Education, 4*(2), 211-222.

Talebloo, B., & Baki, R. B. (2013). Challenges faced by international postgraduate students during their first year of studies. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 3*, 138-145.

Taylor, S., & Frsa, S. (2016). Dimensions of the Framework for Doctoral Supervisors UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF) Dimensions of the Framework for Doctoral Supervisors, (April), 1–25.

Thompson, D. R., Kirkman, S., Watson, R. & Stewart, S. (2005). 'Improving Research Supervision in Nursing'. *Nurse Education Today*, *25*, 283- 290.

Van Rensburg, G. H., Mayers, P., & Roets, L. (2016). Supervision of postgraduate students in higher education. *Trends in Nursing, 3* (1). https://doi.org/10.14804/3-1-55

Wisker, G. (2005). *The Good Supervisor: Supervising Postgraduate and Undergraduate Research for Doctoral Theses and Dissertations*. India: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wisker, G. (2007). *The postgraduate research handbook: Succeed with your MA, MPhil, EdD and PhD*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Wolff, L. (2010). Learning through writing: Reconceptualising the research supervision process. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *22* (3), 229-237.

Wright, T. (2003). Postgraduate research students: People in context? *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 31,* 209-227.

Yeatman, A. (1995). Making supervision relationships accountable: graduate student logs. *Australian Universities' Review, 38*(2), *9*-11

Zaaba, Z., Gunggut, H., Arapa, A., & Aning, I. N. A. (2015). Postgraduate Research Completion: Student Expectation and Inspiration. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *202* (December 2014), 181–188. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.08.221

Appendixes

Appendix A: Students' Questionnaire

Dear participants,

    You are kindly invited to fill in the following questionnaire which aims at delving into the traits supervisees look for in their dissertation supervisors at Master level. Please tick appropriate box(es) or write statements when required. Please provide answers that reflect your personal opinions so as to maximize the reliability of this investigation. Your answers are to be kept anonymous. Your participation is highly appreciated and will be of great help. I thank you in advance for your participation☺.

    Section 01: General Information about the supervisee

1- *Gender:*

    a) Male ☐   b) Female ☐

2- *Age group:*

    a) 20 -25 ☐   b) 26 – 30 ☐   c) 31 - 35 ☐   d) +36 ☐

    Section 02: Finding your dissertation supervisor

3- *Did you have any idea about the desirable characteristics of a supervisor before you started looking for your own supervisor?*

    a) Yes ☐   b) No ☐

    If yes, list some of them ……………………………………………………………………..…………
……
……

4- *During your undergraduate studies, were you informed about the procedure to choose a good supervisor?*

    a) Yes ☐   b) No ☐

    If yes, how did it help? ……………………………………………..………………………………….…
………

Did you meet any challenges/difficulties in finding a dissertation supervisor?

    a) Yes ☐   b) No ☐

    If yes, what are the main challenges you met………………………………………………………………...
……
……

Section 03: Characteristics of a good supervisor

5- *What qualities/ characteristics did you accentuate in choosing your supervisor?* (You may tick more than one option)

Qualities/ characteristics					
Goal oriented		Focused		Demanding	
perceptive		Creative		Evaluative	
committed		Supportive		Friendly	
Practical		Resourceful		Responsive	
Intuitive		Thorough		Prescriptive	
Reflective		Didactic		Flexible	

In case there are other characteristics, please specify them……………………………………………….
……………………………………………………...

6- *Tick the statements that match your opinion most closely.* (You may tick more than one)

With reference to safety base, you appreciate supervisors who:

    a) Respect the supervisee as a person ☐

    b) Collaborate rather than prescribe ☐

    c) Ensure the feeling of safety ☐

    d) Respect supervisees' ideas ☐

    e) Provide constructive criticism without judging ☐

    f) Listen to supervisees openly ☐

In terms of structure, you appreciate supervisors who:

    a) Meet their supervisees regularly ☐

    b) Are organized and plan the sessions ☐

    c) Avoid interruption /cutting short the supervision sessions ☐

For commitment traits, you appreciate supervisors who:

    a) Show enthusiasm about supervision ☐

    b) Avoid making supervisees feel a burden ☐

    c) Are approachable and easy to talk to ☐

    d) Are available and easy to reach ☐

With reference to reflective education, you appreciate supervisors who:

    a) Have a command of theoretical knowledge ☐

    b) Incite supervisees to reflect on their practice ☐

    c) Pay attention to unspoken feelings and anxieties ☐

With reference to role model traits, you appreciate supervisors who:

    a) Are Knowledgeable/well versed in the topic of research ☐

    b) Are practical and provide practical solutions ☐

    c) Have respect among colleagues and administration staff ☐

With reference to formative feedback, you appreciate supervisors who:

       a)   Provide regular feedback on supervisees' performance   ☐

       b)   Balance praise and negative feedback   ☐

       c)   Pay attention to supervisees' level of competence   ☐

       d)   Help identify their supervisees' needs   ☐

7- *In your opinion, how would the characteristics you selected affect the supervision process?*

……………………………………………………………………….………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………..…………………………………….……………..

8- *Are there any traits you do not appreciate in a dissertation supervisor?*

If yes, what are they? …………………………………………………...…………………………...

…………………………………………………………………….…………………………………

……………………………………………………………..……………………..

Thank you very much for your cooperation. ☺

Appendix B: Teachers' Questionnaire

Dear participants,

You are kindly invited to fill in the following questionnaire which aims at delving into the traits supervisees look for in their dissertation supervisors at Master level. Please tick appropriate box(es) or write statements when required. Please provide answers that reflect your personal opinions so as to maximize the reliability of this investigation. Your answers are to be kept anonymous. Your participation is highly appreciated and will be of great help. I thank you in advance for your participation ☺.

Section 01: General Information about the supervisor

1- Gender:

   b) Male   ☐   b) Female ☐

2- Academic degree:

   b) Magister ☐   b) PhD ☐   c) Other (please specify).........................

3-   Years of experience is supervising Master's dissertations: ………. years

4- Did you benefit from any training in dissertation supervision?

   a) Yes ☐   b) No ☐

- If yes, were you informed about the characteristics of a good supervisor? ....
....

- Would you please list the most important ones? ....
....

Section 02: Finding a dissertation supervisor

5- Are students informed about the procedure to choose a good supervisor during their undergraduate studies?

   a) Yes ☐   b) No ☐

6- Do you think supervisees meet challenges/difficulties in finding a dissertation supervisor?

   a) Yes ☐   b) No ☐

If yes, what are the main challenges they met? ....
…...

Section 03: Characteristics of a good supervisor

7- In your opinion, w*hat qualities/ characteristics your students accentuate in choosing their supervisor?* (you may tick more than one option)

Qualities/ characteristics					
Goal oriented		Focused		Demanding	
perceptive		Creative		Evaluative	
committed		Supportive		Friendly	
Practical		Resourceful		Responsive	
Intuitive		Thorough		Prescriptive	
Reflective		Didactic		Flexible	

In case there are other characteristics, please specify them……………………………………………… …………………………………………………………………………………………………….………

8- *Tick the statements that match your opinion most closely.* (You may tick more than one option)

With reference to safety base, supervisees appreciate supervisors who:

a) Respect the supervisee as a person ☐

b) Collaborate rather than prescribe ☐

c) Ensure the feeling of safety ☐

d) Respect supervisees ideas ☐

e) Criticize without judging ☐

f) Listen to supervisees openly ☐

In terms of structure, supervisees appreciate supervisors who:

a) Meet their supervisees regularly ☐

b) Are organized and plan the sessions ☐

c) Avoid interruption /cutting short the supervision sessions ☐

For commitment traits, supervisees appreciate supervisors who:

a) Show enthusiasm about supervision ☐

b) Avoid making supervisees feel a burden ☐

c) Are approachable and easy to talk to ☐

d) Are available and easy to reach ☐

With reference to reflective education, supervisees appreciate supervisors who:

a) Have a command theoretical knowledge ☐

b) Incite supervisees to reflect on their practice ☐

c) Pay attention to unspoken feelings and anxieties ☐

With reference to role model traits, supervisees appreciate supervisors who:

a) Are Knowledgeable/well versed in the topic of research ☐

b) Are practical and provide practical solutions ☐

c) Have respect among colleagues and administration stuff ☐

With reference to formative feedback, supervisees appreciate supervisors who:

        a) Provide regular feedback on supervisees' performance ☐

        b) Balance praise and negative feedback   ☐

        c) Pay attention to supervisees' level of competence   ☐

        d) Help identify their supervisees needs   ☐

9- *In your opinion, how would the characteristics you selected affect the supervision process?*
………….....………………………….................................…..

………

…………………………………………………………..……………………………………………………..

10- *From your experience, what are the traits your students would not appreciate in a dissertation supervisor?* ………….....………………………….................................…..

………

…………………………………………………………..…………………………………………………….

…………………………………………………………..…………………………………………………….

Thank you very much for your cooperation.☺

Appendix C: Consent Form

Description and purpose of the consent form

This consent form seeks to extend an invitation to Master 2 didactics supervisors and supervisees in the Department of English at Tiaret University to take part in a study investigating supervisors' characteristics valued by supervisees. This study is significant because it will increase awareness among students and supervisors regarding the traits of supervisors that supervisees look for.

We anticipate that this exploratory research will enable us to make recommendations that can lead to more effective supervision, better supervisory relationship and improve supervision outcomes for both supervisees and supervisors.

The purpose of this permission form is to ensure that the participants understand the purpose of their involvement in the research and that they are in agreement with the terms of their participation. We sincerely hope that you would agree to willingly participate in this study, as the data you supply will be extremely beneficial to us.

Please note that your responses are to be kept confidential and anonymous because they will be accessed on by the researchers and used solely for research purposes. You will be referred to using pseudonyms when your responses are directly quoted.

You can ask the researchers any question you might have about this study

Thank you very much for your cooperation.☺