



Ph.d. course in literature review:

June 9th 2016 09:00-16:00 Contact: <u>Kare hellewe@ub.no</u> <u>Course location</u> The Faculty of Psychology, Christiesgate 13 <u>Academic responsibility</u> Professor Rune Johan Krumsvik, UoB and Assistant professor Fredrik Mørk Røkenes, NTNU





UNIVERSITETET I BERGEN

Recommended literature:

Golde, C. M. (2000). Should I stay or should I go? Student descriptions of the doctoral attriction process. *The Review of Higher Education*, 23, 199–227 Golde, C.M. (2005). The Role of the Department and Discipline in Doctoral Student Attrition: Lessons from Four Departments. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 6 (76), 668-700 Krumsvik, R., Øfstegaard, M.,Jones, L. (2016), Reminigative or yardeningskitterier for den artikkelbaserte ph.d-avhandlingen. UNIPED 1(39), 78-94.







Introduction



- Congratulations! You are the most carefully selected students in higher education
- You have received a scholarship of 3,2 mill. Nkr.
- "Flying start"? Well....
- New job, new environments, new daily routine, "new order", etc.
- Newcomer and novice in the research community
- Important with "a pat on the back"...



Introduction



How will you bridge the gap from your former communities of practice – to solitary moments in an "academic marathon"...?

Introduction - "The achievement-culture"



• A shock? Or not?

If so, get used to it – we are measured on our achievements: completing courses, presenting papers, publishing articles, writing The Thesis in another language, surviving the disputation,... We are challenged both

- professionally....
-but also mentally.....



Introduction- "The achievement-culture"



- "Publish or perish"
- Break the "publishing-code"
- incomprehensible, difficult, yet necessary The academic, scientific genre is
- stringentJust get used to it!
- Referee-feedback: a formative assessment and quality assurance
- A lot of "downs" in the beginning
- Ask every researcher they have all been rejected! (if they are honest...)
- Constitutes all this an "achievementculture"? Or not? What do you think?

To what extent do you think there is an «achievement culture» in ph.d-programs in Norway today?

- 1. To a great extent
- 2. To some extent
- 3. To hardly any extent
- 4. Not at all



How do we deal with this? Persistence, resilience and formative assessment



- As a ph.d-scholarship you need a high degree of persistence and resilience (the ability to cope with change)
- But, who will <u>support you in your</u> "ph.d-journey"...?
- And what kind of formative assessment to do you receive during this "academic marathon"?
- And who disappear from ph.dprograms without a "fingerprint" (internationally)?









To what extent are you satisfied with the support you receive as a ph.d-scholarship?

- 1. To a great extent
- 2. To some extent
- 3. To hardly any extent
- 4. Not at all



Formative- and summative assessment

- •Formative assessment in 3" cycle (ph.d.) is well developed in Norway since 2002 (NCR 2002, Nifu Step 2012)
- But what about the summative assessment of ph.d.-thesis?
- Any "missing link" ...?



Guidelines and assessment criteria

- PhD by publication is becoming increasingly more common both nationally (77%) as well as internationally.
- But what are the guidelines for such a thesis, and how is such a thesis assessed?

 Through a literature review we find that there are relatively few scientific articles published on the topic, there is a variation both nationally and internationally in terms of whether educational institutions have policies and criteria for such theses or not (Krimsvik et al. 2016) (Krumsvik et al. 2016)

29 % of the ph.d.-programs in Norway had no guidelines (Nifu Step 2012)

UNIPED	Retningslinjer og vurderings- kriterier for artikkelbasert ph.davhandling
Ventoriana ni 244 y 344 Dinistra Robelli Dinistra Robelli Dinistra 2456 di Mattulivingote Artisetta	In a late form A Management of the second of the second of the second of the Versitation and the second of the second of the second of the Versitation and the second of the second of the second of the Management of the second of the second of the second of the Versitation and the second of the second of the second of the Versitation and the second of the second of the second of the Versitation and the second of the second of the second of the Versitation and the second of the second of the second of the Versitation and the second of the second of the second of the Versitation and the second of the second of the second of the Versitation and the second of the second of the second of the second of the Versitation and the second of the second of the second of the second of the Versitation and the second of the Versitation and the second of the second of the second of the second of the Versitation and the second of t
	Antopias Antopias Sector Antopias Sector Antopias Sec

Guidelines and assessment criteria

The article finds that there are many similarities both nationally and internationally, but also some differences with regards to what is expected from such a thesis, requirements when it comes to the content, and how it gets assessed (Krumsvik et al. 2016)

- Based on this, the present article recommends that, although diversity can be good at times, predictability and transparency when it comes to guidelines, requirements and evaluation criteria for the candidates are important with regards to evaluation (Krumsvik et al. 2016)



Guidelines and assessment criteria

On this basis and the fact that PhD is a cross-disciplinary, international degree one should as far as possible have fairly common guidelines, requirements and assessment criteria across disciplines, institutions and countries when it comes to the article-based dissertation (Krumsvik et al. 2016) 2016)



To what extent are you familiar with the guidelines and assessment criteria of doctoral dissertations at University of Bergen?

- 1. To a great extent
- 2. To some extent
- 3. To hardly any extent
- 4. Not at all



The international perspective- attrition "Paradoxically, the most academically capable, most academically successful, most stringenity evaluated, and most carefully selected students in the entire higher education system--doctoral students--are the least likely to complete their chosen academic goals"

"Stunningly high rates of doctoral student attrition, which consistently range from 40 to 50%, are one of academia's well-kept secrets" (Bowen & Rudenstine, 1992; Golde 2000).

Norway? Institutions response to the statement: "We have problems with dropout":

Humanities and Social sciences: 24%, Medicine and Health Sciences: 14%, Natural sciences and Engineering: 23% (Nifu Step 2012)



The international perspective - attrition "The practice has been (for understandable reasons) to concentrate on those students who actually earn doctorates, allowing those who drop out to disappear from sight' (Bowen and Rudenstine 1992, p. 107).

"Such systematic inattention means that students usually leave quietly" (Golde 2000, p. 199)

"Seldom is any information gleaned from departing students; their reasons for leaving doctoral study and institutional factors that exacerbate attrition remain hidden" (Golde 2000, p. 199).

I seems like several, different factors influence the "drop out"-rate (Golde 2005)-> but lack of solid empirical evidence

Assessment-related factors can be one of these factors (Krumsvik et al. 2016)



- "Don, a geology student, left his program at the end of his second year because he failed his candidacy exam and his advisor told him she would no longer work with him. He transferred to another institution and completed"
- "Nathan, an industrial psychologist, left school for an attractive job opportunity after his fourth year in school; after a year, he gave up his plan of writing his dissertation long distance".

"Jane initially loved her art history program but, after a falling out with her advisor, ultimately chose to pursue interests outside the academy" (Golde 2000, p. 199)



What do you think are the main reason for «dropping out» of the ph.d-programs in Norway

- 1. Supervisor
- 2. Research group
- Graduate schools 3.
- 4. Motivation
- 5. Other jobs
- 6. Department
- 7. Other alternatives



From a critical point of view: Why should we have such guidelines and assessment criteria? This is ph.d.-level...?



Why should we have such guidelines and assessment criteria?

Summative assessment - "Black box" or transparent?



Example (Boote and Beile 2005) Increase transparency? Synopsis?

	Tablo 2 Literature Review Scoring Rubric					
Category		Criterion	1	2	3	4
. Coverage	A	kstiffed criteria for inclusion and exclusion from review.	Did not discuss the criteria inclusion or exclusion	Discussed the literature included and excluded	Justified inclusion and exclusion of inarature	
. Synthesis	Β.	Distinguished what has been done in the field from what needs to be done.	Did not distinguish what has and has not been done	Discussed what has and has not been done	Critically examined the state of the field	
	C.	Placed the topic or problem in the broader scholarly intersture	Topic not placed in broader scholarly literature	Some discussion of broader scholarly literature	Topic clearly situated in broader scholarly literature	
	D,	Placed the research in the histori- cal controt of the field.	History of topic not discussed	Some mention of his- tory of topic	Critically examined history of topic	
		Acquired and enhanced the sub- ject vocabulary.	Key vocabulary not discussed	Key vocabulary defined	Discussed and resolved ambigui- ties in definitions	
	F.	Articulated important variables and phenomena relevant to the topic.	Key variables and phenomena not discussed	Reviewed relationships among key variables and phenomena	Noted ambiguities in literature and proposed new relationships	
	G.	Synthesized and gained a new perspective on the literature.	Accepted literature at face value	Some critique of literature	Offered new perspective	
I. Methodology	н	Identified the main methodolo- gies and research techniques that have been used in the field, and their advantages and disadvantages.	Research methods not discussed	Some discussion of re- search methods used to produce claims	Critiqued research methods	Introduced new methods to address problems with predominant methods
	L	Related ideas and theories in the field to research methodologies.	Research methods not discussed	Some discussion of ap- propriateness of re- search methods to watrant claims	Critiqued appropriateness of research methods to warrant claims	
I. Significance	1	Rationalized the practical signifi- cance of the research problem.	Practical significance of research not discussed	Practical significance discussed	Critiqued practical significance of research	
	K.	Rationalized the scholarty significance of the research problem.	Scholarly significance of research not discussed	Scholarly significance discussed	Critiqued scholarly significance of research	
. Rhetoric	L	Was written with a coherent, clear structure that supported the review.	Poorty conceptual- ized, haphazard	Some coherent structure	Well developed, coherent	



UNIVERSITETET I BERGEN

References:

Boote, D., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars Before Researchers: On the Centrality of the Dissertation Literature Review in Research Preparation. Educational Researcher, 34(56), 3-15.

Bowen, W. G., & Rudenstine, N. L. (1992). In pursuit of the PhD. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Golde, C. M. (2000). Should I stay or should I go? Student descriptions of the doctoral attrition process. The Review of Higher Education, 23, 199–227

Golde, C. M. (2005). The Role of the Department and Discipline in Doctoral Student Attrition: lessons from Four Departments. The Journal of Higher Education, 6 (76), 669-700

Hesson's Horn Four Departments. The Journal or Higher Education, 6 (76), 659-700 Krumsvik, R., Øfstegaard, M.; Jones, L. (2016). Retningslinjer og vurderingskriterier for den artikkelbaserte ph.d-avhandlingen. UNI/ED 1(39), 78-94.
NIFU (2012). PhD education in a knowledge society. An evaluation of PhD education in Norway. Report 25/2012. Oslo: NIFU.
Norges Forskningsråd (2002). Evaluering av norsk forskerutdanning. Oslo: Norges

Forskningsråd

Schriven, M. (1991). Evaluation Thesaurus. London: SAGE

