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National Qualification Framework (examples)

**Knowledge:**
- is in the forefront of knowledge within his/her academic field and masters the field’s philosophy of science and/or artistic issues and methods

**General competence:**
- can communicate research and development work through recognized Norwegian and international channels

(The Ministry of Education and Research, 2009)
Supporting PhD students – which challenges are we meeting?

They say I work by «deficiency thinking»

A doctoral programme has booked a librarian!

What kind of support do they need?

Help me out here!!
Developing PhD on Track

1. Identifying needs

2. Testing and developing PhD on Track
Identifying needs
The project (2010/11 – 2013)

**Phase 1**

A study on PhD students’ information behavior and their perceived needs

- Literature review
- Focus group interviews

**Phase 2**

 Developing and testing online modules

- Project partners: The university libraries in Oslo, Bergen and Ålborg and the libraries at The Norwegian School of Economics and Bergen University College

Phase 1: Selected findings

- Information literacy as a process
  - Reading vs searching: reference chasing

- Publishing
  - Discipline based variation: formal requirements vs informal pressure

- Library support
  - Libraries need to strengthen knowledge about research processes
    - Mapping field vs finding specific items
    - Skills gap
    - Complexities

Illustration: http://www.phdontrack.net/
Content development

• *Illustrate* challenges

• *Demonstrate* possible procedures

• *Explain* and *clarify* principles and perspectives

• *Provoke* decision making and reflection
2 Developing and testing
Phase 2: Developing and testing

- Design and technical development
  (contract, Centre for New Media, Bergen University College)

- Developing and editing content
  (project group)

- User testing and quality assurance
  (project group)

Illustrations: http://www.phdontrack.net/
Testing methodology

- Expert evaluation (November 2012)
- Usability testing (January 2013)
- Focus group interview (February 2013)
- Expert evaluation (March 2013)

Illustration: http://www.phdontrack.net/
Selected results of usability tests: challenges

Findings

✔ Clearer communication needed
  Early stage research students

✔ Deeper understanding is needed,
  PhD on Track as a learning resource.
  Didactic examples

✔ Preferred behaviour: browsing by
  scrolling up and down on page

✔ Importance of significant terms

Action

➢ Adressing the individual learner: «You will
  learn», «an academic author should know»

➢ Text structured with clear ingress and
  short introductions. «Show more» for
  further reading and examples. Illustrating
  figures.

➢ Fixed menues

➢ Enhanced consistancy

Illustration: http://www.phdontrack.net/
Submitting articles

Once you have chosen where to publish, you must prepare your manuscript according to the requirements of the publisher. You may publish your research in books, journals or conference proceedings. This page guides you through the process of preparing a manuscript for submission to a peer-reviewed journal, including:

- instructions to authors
- structuring your manuscript
- submission of the manuscript
- the peer-review process
Illustrate challenges

unnecessary work to choose a journal which require a total change in structure and layout. Once your manuscript has been accepted for publication, you will receive a manuscript proof that you have to read carefully, to check that there are no printing or layout errors.

Figure: Based on Dershl, 2003, 2011.

Back to top
Explain and clarify principles

The Impact Factor (IF) is based on the number of citations (A) in the current year to items published in the previous 2 years and the number of articles (B) published in the same two years: IF=A/B.

![Graph showing citations and publications over years](image)

Figure: The grey shaded areas indicate the citations received for articles published in 2009 (light grey) and 2010 (dark grey). Only citations in 2011 contribute to the Impact Factor for 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF for 2011</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citations in 2011 of articles published in</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles published in</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DILEMMA – HOW TO LIST AUTHORS IN A COLLABORATIVE WORK?

A PhD student has been working on an article in collaboration with her supervisor and other students. What to do if there arises a dispute over co-authorship?

All of the students and the supervisor have contributed to the writing, reviewing and collecting of data, and are therefore all listed as co-authors on the by-line of the article.

The article is in the process of being submitted to a prestigious journal, when the leader of the research group (Professor A) contacts the supervisor. Professor A takes it for granted that he will be on the by-line of the article. The authors will be listed alphabetically, which means that Professor A will be the first author on the by-line. The PhD student, who has done most of the work, will be listed as author number three.

He has several arguments for this:

- He is an experienced and well sought after researcher in the field.
- He has published several articles in the journal earlier, and also knows one of the editors.
- Putting him on the author list might make it easier to get the article accepted in the journal.
- He also argues that since the project has financed the work on the article, it is only reasonable that he should be on the author list.

In his instance: What do you think should be the criteria for authorship? What is the fairest way to list authors on the by-line of the article?
Demonstrate possible procedures

If violated – what to do?

Your material has been used in contravention of your copyright, e.g. someone has used your work and has not attributed it to you.

Contact the violator and find out if he or she is willing to withdraw or change the work according to what is right. If not, as a last resort: make a formal legal complaint in the court system.

MODEL LETTER FOR CONTACTING A VIOLATOR OF YOUR COPYRIGHT

Here you will find an example of a letter you can write if your copyright is violated.

[Your name, and contact information (indicate how you are most easily contacted)] Today’s date

[Name and contact information of the copyright infringer or the publisher of the work in which the copyrighted material is misused]

Dear [name]

It has come to my attention that you have used some of my material in contravention of my copyright. The material in question is:

[Give a full citation, a description of the material and where it is published]
Selected results of usability tests: positive feedback

Finding

✓ One stop shop! All of the research process collected. Pointed out as unique!
✓ Logic structure
✓ Categories give meaning
✓ Selected topics seen as relevant

Illustration: http://www.phdontrack.net/
Supporting PhD students – which challenges are we meeting?

They say I work by «deficiency thinking»

Cross disciplinary?
I don’t know a thing about law

What kind of support do they need?

They say they are experts in team!

A research team needs help in applying for project money.

A doctoral programme has booked a librarian!

Do I know how the publication process works in that field?

Help me out here!!

Evidence based?
Knowledge based?
Your life as a scientist...

Research

Search for - and evaluate information

Funding for your research

Writing

Scientific idea

Submit a funding proposal

Where to publish Evaluate!

Publish in a scientific journal

Get cited

More money 😊
Looking forward.....?

- Evaluation: applied in courses
- Additional content: examples from different disciplines
- Considerations on additional topics
- Dialogue with similar projects/products
- Marketing and implementation
- Continuing feedback - ASK US button

Illustration: http://www.phdontrack.net/
Concluding remarks

Gains:

Perceived as relevant by the target group
Integrating library support in the research process
Support for developing our teaching of PhD students

Further challenges:

Balancing roles in the academic community
Audience does not discriminate the library from wider research support

Illustration: http://www.phdontrack.net/
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Thank you for your attention!