PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
UNIVERSITY

SEICOLEG
BANGOR
PSYCHOLOGY
Sef. Est. 1963

School of Psychology

Guide for PhD and Masters by Research students

2017/18

CONTENTS

This guide is for research students in the School of Psychology. It supplements the following guidelines:

Bangor University, Handbook for Research Students and Supervisors

Bangor University Regulations for Postgraduate Research Programmes

The British Psychological Society: Code of Human Research Ethics

We would encourage everyone to always refer to the Academic Registry web site for the most up-to-date versions of Regulations, Procedures, Guidelines and Codes of Practice.

A copy of this guide is available from the Psychology Intranet. This can be accessed using your University login and password https://inside.bangor.ac.uk/psychology/. The research section of the intranet also contains guidance documents on research ethics and governance.

This guide is intended to be as comprehensive as possible. However, they may be subject to changes made appropriate by initiatives at National, University, Faculty, or School level. Similarly, there may be particular situations, which are not covered by existing guidelines. Such cases will be considered by the PhD Committee. Regulations regarding registration, time limits, and progress towards a research degree in the School of Psychology are in accordance with the rules set down by the University, national research councils (e.g. the ESRC), and the BPS. For these reasons and because of our own concerns with quality, the regulations in the School are sometimes more stringent than those set down by the University. Psychology students must thus often fulfill certain requirements not set out in general university regulations. It is imperative that all Psychology students follow the regulations set out here.

Any time limits mentioned apply to full time students and should be adjusted appropriately for part time students. Similarly, the guidelines are written with the assumption that students start their studies at the beginning of the academic year. Any dates mentioned should be adjusted appropriately for students commencing their studies at other times of the year (students can normally start a PhD on the first day of any month).

No one is more concerned or involved in your PhD degree than YOU are. Please read these guidelines carefully. Note the requirements and ensure that the timetabled events actually happen. If at any stage of your studies you believe that anything is going awry, then let your Supervisory Committee, the Senior Postgraduate Tutor, or the Director of the PhD Programme know immediately.

DEADLINES FOR 2017/18

SUBMISSION OF INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMME OF STUDY (FORM A): **OCTOBER 31ST, 2017. For all new students PhD and Masters by Research**

PRELIMINARY RESEARCH REVIEW MEETINGS TO BE HELD IN FEBRUARY 2018. DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF PRELIMINARY REVIEW DOCUMENTS (FORM B): **FEBRUARY 28TH, 2018**

SECOND, THIRD OR FOURTH YEAR RESEARCH REVIEW MEETINGS TO BE HELD IN JUNE 2018. DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF REVIEW DOCUMENTS (FORMS-PGR1a/PGR1b/PGR2) : **JUNE 30TH, 2018.**

1. POSTGRADUATE TRAINING FOR A PHD

One of the very first things you need to consider, in conjunction with your supervisor, is whether you need to take any of the post-graduate training modules, and if so, which ones. If you have previously completed an MSc that is recognised by the ESRC, then you don't need to do it again. Courses offered by Bangor, including the MSc in Psychological Research, MSc in Foundations of Clinical Psychology, and MSc in Clinical & Health Psychology & Principles of Clinical Neuropsychology are recognised by the ESRC. Otherwise **everyone** is expected to complete an equivalent degree of postgraduate training in order to proceed to the PhD. In practice, this means that you must take and pass the following MSc modules in the first year of your PhD. The modules we require you to take are:

PRP4014 – Advanced Research Methods (20 Credits)
PRP4010 – Communicating Research in Psychology (20 Credits)

You will need to check when the modules are running and sign up for them as soon as possible by contacting Cerys Gadd c.w..gadd@bangor.ac.uk.
It is your responsibility to be on top of signing up for the relevant MSc modules if you need to take them. Please do not expect your supervisor to let you know this. The PhD Committee will review MSc module requirements at the end of each year, and students who have failed to take the appropriate modules during year 1 of the PhD will be required to take them in year 2.

In exceptional cases, parts of this requirement can be waived in recognition of significant other experience, for example work-related experience. This needs to be discussed with your supervisor and supervisory committee, and needs to be approved by the PhD Management Committee

Please note that part-time students may spread the modules over the first two years. Which route you go depends on many things, in particular your funding situation. You should consult with your supervisory committee about which way is the best for you.

2. REGISTRATION

No one can be accepted as a PhD student in the School of Psychology until they have submitted an application form to the Bangor University Postgraduate Admissions Office. Application forms and guidance notes are available from the PhD Administrator. Anyone applying for a postgraduate student fellowship or grant should concurrently apply for admission to the postgraduate programme.

All PhD students are initially registered as **probationary** candidates for the PhD during Year 1 of the PhD work (after the attainment of the MSc). Removal of probationary status is conditional on satisfactory progress, as determined by the School's PhD Management Committee (see further details below).

3. TIME LIMITS

Full-time PhD students are required to submit their PhD dissertation within four years from the time they register as PhD students. Because most students only have three years of funding, **we strongly encourage everyone to finish within the first three years.**

Masters by Research students have one year plus three months for writing up the thesis.

Part-time PhD students are required to enroll for six years and are expected to complete the PhD within eight years.

Funded students – remember to check carefully the terms and conditions of your studentship funding for any additional requirements or differences to the timelines set out in this guide. The rules on the Year 1 probationary period and subsequent reviews still apply.

<u>PhD students working as Research Officers / Research Support Officers within the School: Staff fee waiver</u>

Students on RO /RPSO contracts supported by grants may register for a PhD if the bulk of their grant-supported research forms part of their PhD, and if the pursuit of the PhD is explicitly agreed to by the RO's line manager. Such students can register as full- or part-time students (depending on the nature of their employment contract, contact Everil McQuarrie to confirm). NB this arrangement might potentially raise difficulties concerning intellectual ownership of the research. The supervisor needs to agree to put the student in a position to claim significant intellectual ownership.

Research staff must obtain written agreement from their Line Manager at the time of employment stating whether they are permitted to pursue a PhD degree while employed on a project. (Research staff will not be admitted to the PhD programme without such a written agreement.) That agreement should also state whether the staff member is expected to follow the normal pattern outlined above for PhDs.

Research Staff must complete the 'Application for Admission & Registration to a Higher Degree Scheme by Research by Members of Staff and Research Assistants', which is available from Everil McQuarrie

4. PROGRESS TOWARDS THE PHD

People and Responsibilities

A successful PhD involves many people, playing a variety of roles. What follows is not a list of bullet-pointed responsibilities, but a general indication of the people involved and the parts they play in the PhD.

Student. Of course the ultimate success of the PhD rests with the student. What is meant by a successful PhD? What is the value of PhD training? The British Psychological Society (BPS), argue that the purpose of PhD assessment, including the thesis and the viva, is to establish that the candidate is ready to conduct independent research. It stands to reason then that the primary purpose of PhD training is to prepare the student to be an excellent and independent researcher. Ultimately, the award of a PhD must reflect that the student has achieved this standard.

The student also bears important responsibility in their review meetings, preparing written work according to the committee's recommendations, and discussing their work in the meetings of the supervisory committee (see below). These meetings are intended to give students practice in discussing their ideas, and to permit feedback from members of the School other than the supervisor. If students are unhappy with anything concerning their work, it is their responsibility to raise the issue with the appropriate person, roughly in order, the supervisor, the chairperson of the supervisory committee, the Senior Postgraduate Tutor if the committee chair is unavailable, or is, for some reason, inappropriate.
Please report any important changes in your circumstances to your supervisor AND the PhD administrator – changes might include your name or address, funding information, project title etc.

Supervisor. The most significant other role is the supervisor. The student and supervisor will be working together for several years, and a good working relationship is important. The relationship between PhD student and supervisor is different from the relationship, for example, between a research assistant and supervisor. The PhD supervisor is meant to assist the student's research training and development as an independent researcher. To illustrate the difference, a crucial responsibility of the supervisor is to put the PhD student in the position necessary to legitimately claim a high degree of intellectual ownership over the research. This would not necessarily be true of an RA. The reason for this is that the work done over the next several years will be the basis for the PhD student's assessment as an independent researcher.

Second supervisor. The second supervisor is usually someone working in a similar research area as the student. The second supervisor will generally provide academic advice and support. Because of their familiarity with the research area and student's topic, the second supervisor is the most likely person to take over regular supervision should the primary supervisor become unable for any reason to continue. This reflects practicalities rather than any specific rule.

Chair. The major responsibility of the chairperson is to ensure that the system of goal setting, review, and monitoring proceeds smoothly. Of course the chair is also free to offer academic advice and support. The chair might or might not be an expert in the student's specific research area, and it can be an advantage for the committee to have a perspective that is not immersed in the details of the research. The chairperson is the first person who should be consulted should the relationship between supervisor and student go awry.

Supervisory committee. The supervisory committee consists of the student, supervisor, second supervisor, and chair. This committee meets on a regular basis to examine the student's progress, identify success and impediments to research, and keep the PhD committee informed on progress. Based on recommendations from the student and supervisor, the PhD Committee appoints committee members in accordance with the policies of equitable distribution of committee loads across the staff within the School, balance between senior and junior staff members on each committee, and concerns for continuity should one member of the committee need to withdraw for any reason.

Committee members will be proposed at admission by the student's supervisor. The PhD Committee will appoint the student's committee on the basis of this recommendation in conjunction with considerations of (1) balance of staff members across committees, (2) balance of senior and junior staff members within committees, and (3) ensuring continuity of supervision through the tenure of a student's studies.

School of Psychology PhD Committee. The School's PhD Committee oversees all aspects of the PhD programme, and represents the interests of the student, and the School more generally. The committee wants to ensure that students are in an environment that gives them a fair chance of success. Likewise, the committee must protect the large investment of the School in the PhD programme, to see that this investment produces good students and good research. An important role of the committee is therefore to monitor the progress reports from all the School's students, and see that recommendations are appropriate and acted upon. The PhD committee is also responsible for deciding whether a Year 1 PhD student is progressed following the probationary period.

Individual Programme of Study

All students need to develop a plan of study, in conjunction with their supervisor. Every PhD student must meet with their supervisor early in the first semester, no later than Week 2. It is especially important to identify as early as possible any MSc modules that need to be taken during Year 1. This meeting is also the time to consider other relevant issues, including:

- Training and development needs
- Frequency of meetings (see Section 5.1 below for further discussion)
- Nature and timing of feedback (see Section 5.2)
- Unresolved issues relating to financial support
- Target dates for different stages of the research
- Principles for determining authorship on research outputs (Section 6.1)
- Any ethical considerations for your research (Section 6.2)
- Nominations for second supervisor and chair of the student's supervisory committee

An Individual Programme of Study **(Form A)** that includes training plans, research goals to be met, and specific dates for completion and monitoring must be submitted by **31st October**.

Reviews

The PhD administrator will send the relevant review forms to individuals at the beginning of February and June with details of how they should be completed. All forms should be returned to Everil McQuarrie by the deadlines stated in this guide.

During the first year, the student's progress will be evaluated both **in February and June** (for full-time students)**,** according to the requirements of the School and the goals outlined in the student's Individual Programme of Study. In following years, progress is evaluated **each June**, or more frequently if necessary. For each February review, students complete and submit a written report **Form B.** In June the student completes and submits **PGR1a/PGR1b/PGR2**

The PDR requires the following documentation prior to each review meeting chaired by the Thesis Committee Chair:

- **Form PGR1a** – a confidential survey completed by the student, which is only seen by the Thesis Committee Chair and/or Director of PGR Studies, and gives the student to opportunity to raise issues about progress and support they have received.
- **Form PGR1b** – an evidenced based self-assessment by the student of their progress to data and future research plans.
- **Form PGR2** – an assessment of student progress against a set of criteria outlined in Table 1 below, completed by Thesis Committee (supervisor(s), the student and the Chair) following each review meeting.

These should be returned to the PhD administrator. The minutes from the meeting should be attached to this form.

Some of the most important meetings are discussed below.

Year 1: Criteria for Upgrading from Probationary Status

The review meetings and evaluations are especially important in Year 1. This is because the student is under probationary status in Year 1 and a case must be made and supported that the student should progress to Year 2. If this case is not made then the student's PhD (and studentship if applicable) may be terminated.

A primary criterion to be used in making this decision is the likelihood of the thesis being submitted within three years. To this end, much will be based on the first and especially the second research reviews. The second review is intended to make the case to the PhD committee that the student should progress. There are two main aspects to this case. First, the committee is also looking for a realistic plan to complete the thesis within the following two years. However, even a very detailed plan is not as convincing for example as completed thesis chapters or submitted papers. Second then, as the PhD is now one-third complete, it is important to see substantive, concrete evidence of progress on the thesis. This could take a variety of forms, for example, submitted or published papers, completed experiments, completed chapters, presentations, etc. Basically the committee is looking to see that the student has already completed material that can be included in the thesis. This means that the thesis is already "underway" (i.e. partially complete), and also indicates that the student is likely to make further progress in subsequent years.

Subsequent Reviews

Because of the strict submission deadlines, the reviews at the end of Year 3 (and any subsequent reviews) are also important. The supervisory committee needs to keep a careful watch on progress during this time. If submission under the deadline is looking unlikely, then it is important to notify the PhD Committee as soon as possible. The PhD Committee will try to assist the student, supervisor, and supervisory committee in meeting this deadline. It is possible in some cases to obtain extensions.

If a student has not completed the write-up of the thesis by June of the third year, s/he will need to have a review meeting in June of the third year (and every February and June of subsequent years until completion). There need not be a written report prepared for such meetings, but the student will report on his/her progress to date and on what work still needs to be done for completion of the thesis. The purpose of the meeting is to ensure that the student is still moving forward effectively towards completion and to enable the student's committee to provide any necessary assistance to help guarantee completion of the work.

5. THE MECHANICS OF SUPERVISION

Students and supervisors often ask for guidelines on the amount and nature of interaction between a PhD student and the PhD primary supervisor. It should be stressed that there are no hard and fast rules on what will work for individual cases. So much depends on the nature of the project, the preparation of the student, and the extent to which the student or the supervisor is the source of the project being undertaken.

However, the School recommends as a general guide the following. If you find that your situation is deviating a great deal from these guidelines, the student and the supervisor should discuss this to come up with a mutually satisfactory agreement. If either the student or the supervisor feels that the level of interaction is inadequate and they cannot find a mutually acceptable arrangement between them, they should discuss this with the members of the student's committee or the Director of PhD Programme.

1. Meetings

The number, frequency, and duration of meetings may vary considerably from student to student, and from year to year. As a general guide, the School recommendation is as follows:

Year 1: Frequent meetings are required--weekly, fortnightly, or at least once every three weeks. A good practice is to set aside a regular time slot when the student and supervisor intend to meet. **(Please see Section 6.4 in this guide on Attendance Monitoring).** This meeting should be on a one-on-one basis, unless other members of the committee are asked to participate. At such meetings, the student and supervisor might discuss literature, methodology, or theoretical matters relevant to the PhD work.

All postgraduate students should meet with their supervisors early in their studies to establish with the supervisor a working agreement--how often will they meet, what should the student have prepared for those meetings, how much should the student submit to the supervisor in writing, etc. It is in the interests of both the student and the supervisor that such matters be arranged from the beginning.

Year 2: Meetings should continue on a weekly to monthly basis. Depending on the status of the PhD work, the student and supervisor might agree to continue relatively frequent meetings begun in Year 1, or they may decide to meet somewhat less frequently. The recommendation would be that such meetings occur at least on a monthly basis, no less frequently. As the student is designing and implementing data collection, etc., the student and supervisor may desire more frequent meetings, so that the student can get the supervisor's input on methodological issues.

Year 3: Monthly meetings. As the student advances in his/her work, the student and supervisor may determine that the frequency of planned meetings can be reduced. Again, it is recommended that they still meet at least once a month. They may find, further, that as data are being analysed, more frequent meetings are again required, so the student can get the supervisor's input on those analyses.

All Years: Apart from these general guidelines, it is imperative that the supervisor make him/herself accessible to the student. It is recommended that the supervisor let PhD students know when he or she will hold office hours for more ad hoc consultation. The student should remember that it is not the supervisor's responsibility to be available on every day of the week, at any time of day; rather, the supervisor should provide the student with information on the best means for arranging such more ad hoc meetings--whether it is making an appointment by e-mail, dropping by during office hours, or the like.

2. Feedback

Again, it is difficult to specify any hard and fast rules about the nature and timing of feedback that supervisors should give to students on their work, particularly written work. Periodically the student will wish to give the supervisor written work, whether it is plans for methodology, literature reviews, or data analysis. It is the supervisor's responsibility to give feedback on this written work in a timely fashion. What is 'a timely fashion'? The student should not expect the supervisor to be able to provide feedback the next day, or not even necessarily within the week. Every supervisor has a life and commitments, both professional and personal--beyond the PhD student. However, it is reasonable for the student to expect feedback within two or three weeks (unless the supervisor has extenuating duties, such as conferences, taking up time during those weeks). Certainly if there is no feedback, say, within a month of the student handing some materials to the supervisor, the student and supervisor should discuss this, and the supervisor should make a firm commitment as to when s/he can provide such feedback. If an unacceptable period of time elapses after this time, the student and/or supervisor should discuss this matter with the student's committee or the Senior Postgraduate Tutor.

3. Taking initiative

Beyond interaction with the supervisor and committee, the student should be proactive in making effective use of resources within the School. Bangor is a highly-rated research environment (in the latest Research Assessment Exercise, Bangor rated 7th out of 75 psychology departments in Research Power), and students should take advantage of this fact. It is rare that an academic has the opportunity to interact with so many experts in so many distinct areas of psychology, all in one department, and all available virtually on a daily basis. In particular, we recommend that students attend as many seminars as they can, and not only in their own research area. They should also interact as much as possible with other members of staff besides those on their committees.

In addition, students should take the initiative to interact as much as possible with other postgraduate students, not just on an informal basis but also on an academic basis. Students should consider starting up journal clubs or reading groups in their areas (and they should certainly become active members of any existing Journal clubs available to them.

6. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

1. Ethics of publication and authorship conventions

As students' PhD work gets to a point at which it might be publishable, the question often arises as to ethical issues such as the standards for reporting of scientific findings, duplication of publication, plagiarism, and so forth. Detailed guidance on these issues is given in the British Psychological Society Principles of Publishing document, which is copied in **Appendix I** in full. Students should familiarise themselves thoroughly with this information.

Because the thesis must reflect the student's abilities for independent research, it is a general expectation that the student will be first author in papers arising from work in the PhD thesis. This general expectation does not mean that the student must or should be first author on all papers. The supervisory committee should be able to offer guidance on specific cases. If needed, the School's PhD committee can also offer advice.

2. Ethical considerations

All research carried out in the School of Psychology requires approval from the School's Research Ethics and Governance Committee. Research may only commence once approval has been given. It is important to ensure that your research complies with all relevant legislation (Data Protection Act, Mental Capacity Act, Child Protection Procedures, Human Tissues Act). Advice and guidance on ethical considerations and on the approval procedures are set out in the Ethics Approval System, which can be accessed from the School of Psychology's home page.

If your research involves working with on NHS premises or with NHS patients then you will need to apply for NHS ethics approval and an NHS Research Passport. Please be aware that if your research involves participants that have been identified because of their past or present use of NHS services then you will also need to apply for NHS ethics approval. Please check this with your supervisor.

Information on NHS research ethics and NHS Research Passport is available from the Psychology Intranet.

Disclosure and Barring Service checks (formerly known as CRB) – if your research involves working with under-18s or vulnerable adults then you may require a DBS check depending on the type of research being undertaken.

Please check the guidance on the DBS website https://www.gov.uk/disclosure-barring-service-check/overview

If having checked the website you think a check is needed then forms are available from the School Manager, Hefin Francis. Checks can take up to 6 weeks and need to have been received by the

School before your research is due to commence (ethics approval may also be subject to providing evidence of a clear DBS check).

3. Problems

It sometimes happens that problems can arise in the supervisory arrangements. The supervisory mechanisms outlined above are meant to help identify problems before they jeopardise the thesis. If either student or supervisor is unhappy with the supervisory arrangements, they need to discuss the matter. The chairperson of the supervisory committee is mainly responsible for resolving these difficulties. If necessary, the Senior Postgraduate Tutor (Dr Paloma Mari-Beffa) can then be brought in.

Procedures for withdrawal have been laid down by the University. A student who wishes to withdraw, whether the intention is to withdraw temporarily or permanently, will in the first instance see either the Director of PhD Programme or his/her supervisor, who may approach the Director of PhD Programme on the student's behalf. Action taken in particular cases will depend on the procedures of the relevant funding body.

4. Attendance Monitoring

Residency

It is expected that full time students studying at Bangor University will normally live in Bangor or in the immediate vicinity. All students must provide an up to date address and contact telephone number whilst studying at the University.

Monitoring Your Attendance.

The University has a duty of care to its students; ensuring that each student makes the most of the learning opportunities available to them. In line with the Student Charter, students will be expected to attend **ALL** timetabled teaching sessions for their degree programme.

The School will monitor (where relevant):

- Your attendance at seminars, tutorials, laboratory sessions and on professional placements (including placements for language students)
- Your attendance at exams
- Your submission of assignments
- Your attendance at supervisory meetings

The School will also undertake a random sampling of attendance at lectures.

Any unauthorised absences will be recorded by your school. A points-based system will be used to record unauthorised absences and your school will monitor your attendance record throughout the year. Points awarded will depend upon the event/activity missed. Where your attendance record gives cause for concern, the School will contact you to discuss the reasons for this and also to identify any additional support that you may require.

If any absences occur due to special circumstances (e.g. illness or family bereavement) you must inform your school as soon as possible so that your records can be updated. To support your absence, the school may seek additional evidence e.g. a doctor's note.

If you require time away from University and from your studies, you must contact your supervisor and the PhD Administrator to inform them of your plans in advance of your absence.

If you feel that an unauthorised absence has been mistakenly recorded, you should contact the school as soon as possible.

International Students:

As an International Student, if you miss a succession of timetabled teaching sessions or supervisory meetings, the school will contact you to discuss further why you have been absent. If the reasons for your unauthorised absences are not deemed satisfactory, the University is obliged by UK law to inform the UK Border Agency which may have consequences for your student visa and on your ability to continue studying in the UK.

Therefore it is extremely important that you attend all of your timetabled teaching sessions and / or meetings and inform the school if you have any planned absences.

If you plan to be absent from the University at any point during your studies as a registered student, you must inform the school of your plans well in advance of your absence and ensure that your contact information is up to date.

Please remember that you must have a valid student visa for the whole duration of your university course. If you need help with your visa application, please contact the International Student Support Office.

7. THESIS SUBMISSION AND EXAMINATION

Guidance on the submission and presentation of the PhD thesis can be found in the University's Regulations for Postgraduate Research Programmes which is available on the Academic Registry website.

Some useful guidance on the purpose of the thesis and viva can be found in **Appendix II** of this guide.

Copies of the BPS Guidelines for Assessment of the PhD in Psychology and Related Disciplines (2008 revised version) are available from Everil McQuarrie.

Extension of access to computing and library facilities

Students in their 'writing-up' period who require continued access and use of University computing and library facilities need to complete the appropriate application form (please contact Everil).

8. KEY CONTACTS AND ROLES

Dr Richard Ramsey – Director of PhD Committee

r.ramsey@bangor.ac.uk

Prof. Emily Cross – Member of PhD Committee (Professional development)

e.cross@bangor.ac.uk

Dr Manon Jones – Member of PhD Committee (Pastoral care)

manon.jones@bangor.ac.uk

Dr David Carey – Member of PhD Committee (Progression and monitoring)

d.carey@bangor.ac.uk

Everil McQuarrie – PhD Administrator

psychology-pgr-admin@bangor.ac.uk

There are four academic members of the School PhD committee. Each member contributes to general decisions regarding PhD-related matters, chairs PhD committees and has a specific role to focus on also.

The four members and specialist roles are as follows:

Richard Ramsey (Chair)
David Carey (Progression and monitoring)
Manon Jones (Pastoral care)
Emily Cross (Professional development)

In addition to the above, there are additional members of staff who chair PhD committees and report back to the PhD committee following PhD student reviews. These are:

Charles Leek
Caroline Bowman
Ken Valyear

As Manon mentioned at the PhD induction day in October, pastoral care is taken seriously in the school. First and foremost, supervisors will be an important source of support for any PhD student. If additional support is needed and if a student would like to discuss something in confidence, then the mechanism is as follows:

- First, speak to the chair of your specific PhD committee to discuss the issue.
- Second, speak to Manon Jones in her pastoral care role.
- Third, contact the chair of the School PhD committee.

Additionally, as stipulated by the university, during all PhD student reviews, there is an opportunity to make confidential comments that are only read by myself as Chair of the committee and David Carey in his role overseeing progression and monitoring.

APPENDIX I

Principles of publishing

Authors: Annilee Game & Michael A. West, Organization Studies, Aston Business School

Issues of authorship, duplicate publication and plagiarism in scientific journal papers can cause considerable conflict among members of research teams and embarrassment for both authors and editors. Accordingly, the British Psychological Society has produced the following set of guidelines for prospective authors who are also members of the Society. **Five core issues are covered by the recommendations on the principles of publishing outlined below: authorship, duplicate publication, plagiarism, accuracy of reporting, and the role of reviewers.**

Authorship

The overriding principle of the recommendations on authorship is that only those collaborators who have made a significant scientific contribution should be credited as authors. It is not only the writers of the paper who are entitled to authorship. Inclusion is merited if an individual has made a major scientific contribution to the research project as a whole and/or the writing of the paper.

Specifically, significant contributions are:

- Origination and formulation of the research idea and hypotheses
- Design of the research
- Designing and conducting major analysis
- Interpreting findings
- Writing a major section of the journal article

A number of other contributions essential to the smooth running of the research endeavor do not merit authorship, but nevertheless should be acknowledged in a note. Minor contributions are generally considered as technical activities that provide no significant intellectual/scientific input into the research process. Authorship is not warranted if these are the sole activities undertaken by an individual. Examples of minor contributions include:

- Collection of data (including interviewing) and data entry, if these do not include a significant intellectual/scientific input

- Supervised data analysis
- Designing or building research apparatus
- Recruiting research participants and other administrative duties
- Advising on statistical issues

The order in which authors' names appear should be determined by the relative size of each individual's contribution. Thus, an individual who is judged consensually to have made the most significant contribution to the paper would normally be the first named author. A collaborator who has been a major contributor to the research overall, but has a lesser role in writing a journal article would not qualify for principal authorship, but should be listed as a co-author. In cases where two or more authors have had equal roles in the research and writing processes, names can be ordered randomly, or alphabetically, with an author's note as explanation for the reader. If a project leads to several journal articles in which all authors made a demonstrably equal contribution to both the research and writing for every paper, authors can decide to alternate first authorship. In many medical journals it is now required that authors specify in their letters of submission the relative weight and content of the contributions of each named author.

Neither the inclusion nor ordering of names should be influenced by the relative status of the collaborating individuals. Authorship is not merited by virtue of being, for example, the head of the research group or department in which the research was undertaken. In the case of student-supervisor collaborations, the student should usually be the principal author when the article is substantially based on the student's research. Supervisors should therefore seek to ensure that the student is enabled to make the major contribution in order to merit first authorship. Exceptions to the rule should be made only if:

- All of the ideas and the design for the research were the supervisor's (for example, if undergraduates or MSc students elect to do their dissertation research on 'ready-made' projects proposed by their supervisors)
- Extremely close supervision was required in order to produce the paper
- The supervisor conducted (or closely guided) further extensive analysis that was beyond the scope of the original research and had made a sustained and major contribution to the research prior to that.

Prior agreement must be reached with the student if the supervisor intends to publish under any of the above provisos. Since students may often lack knowledge and power in these situations, supervisors are obliged to manage each case fairly and openly, in accordance with the ethical guidelines, ideally seeking the opinion of senior colleagues who should be provided with a copy of these principles.

Equitable and accurate attribution of authorship will be facilitated if clear task requirements and task allocations are established at the outset. Explicit discussion of which tasks will be worthy of which level of credit should be included in the design phase of the research. However, decisions should be reviewed and revised as appropriate in the light of changes during the course of the project.

It is often the case that writing continues long after the original research team has disbanded. The same rules of authorship should apply to post-project output. At a minimum, no work should be undertaken, or authorship assumed, without prior consultation with all former collaborators. Careful co-ordination and communication can prevent the misappropriation of credit for the original research, and reduce the possibility of duplicate publication.

Duplicate publication

Duplicate publication occurs when authors pass off, as original, research that has been published either substantially or in its entirety elsewhere. Duplicate papers have shared hypotheses, data, discussion points, or conclusions, but do not cross-reference the prior publication. Not only does duplicate publication constitute a possible copyright violation, it also deceives the scientific community as to the extent of knowledge in a given field. While ultimately the decision to publish lies with the journal editor, the burden of responsibility for preventing duplication falls to the author(s).

Authors should not submit identical or substantially similar work if it has already been published in another outlet. Examples of alternative outlets include book chapters and published conference proceedings of whole papers (as opposed to abstracts). If the work has previously been published only as a conference abstract or as a working paper, this does not constitute duplicate publication since these tend to have a limited audience. Indeed, many institutions actively encourage the use of conferences and working paper series as routes to developing ideas for journal articles.

The prior publication of any similar work (e.g. other papers based on the same data and methods, or using the same sample) should be clearly referenced in the manuscript. Authors should also inform the editor of any such work already existing, or about to be published. The editor must then decide whether the manuscript includes enough new information to warrant publication. Authors should avoid 'cutting and pasting' (i.e. copying verbatim) substantial chunks of text from their own previously published work. Moderate duplication, involving no more than a few paragraphs throughout the paper, is acceptable provided that reference is made to the publication in which the material first appeared.

Re-publication of a paper in another language does not constitute duplication, provided that information concerning the original source is disclosed to the editor at the time of submission. The published paper should be clearly labelled as a translation.

Authors should submit manuscripts to only one publisher at a time, and the content of papers submitted to different publishers before any decision has been reached should not have substantial overlap. Only if rejected should the manuscript be sent to another publisher. Whilst this substantially increases the lead-time from writing to publication, it is a fundamental measure that will help to ensure that copyright infringements and duplications do not occur.

Authors who fragment their work into a series of papers must be able to justify doing so on the grounds that it enhances scientific communication. Maximizing quantity of publications at the expense of providing a complete and coherent contribution to psychological knowledge is strongly discouraged.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is defined as taking another person's ideas or writings and using them as if they were one's own. Plagiarism applies to both published and unpublished ideas, and electronic (e.g. internet publications, e-mail) as well as print versions of material. It may occur at any point in the research process: from planning to writing for publication.

When another's written words are lifted directly from a text, whether published or unpublished, quotation marks should be used and the source of the quotation cited. If paraphrasing is used (summarising or slightly altering the original exposition of a written

idea), the source of the paraphrase must be credited. All sources of ideas that were not conceived by the author(s) should be acknowledged in the paper. This includes ideas received in the form of personal communications and comments from reviewers, colleagues, or peers. Meticulous note-taking and record-keeping are recommended in order to ensure that all ideas are accurately attributed to the correct sources.

Accuracy of reporting

Accuracy of reporting forms the cornerstone of advances in psychological theory and knowledge of its applications. Hence, authors are ethically obligated to present a true and accurate account of their research process and findings.

Full explanation of all data collection methods, and the tools and techniques used in analysis, should be included in the report. Data should be available for inspection at the request of the editor. Researchers should not falsify or modify data to make the results fit the research hypotheses. Data that does not fit neatly into the predicted patterns must not be omitted from the write-up. If any errors are discovered in the data following publication, they should be made public as soon as possible (e.g. via correction, retraction or erratum procedures, according to circumstances and the publisher's protocol). Ideally, data should be kept on file (or deposited in an appropriate archive) for five years following completion of the study except where this endangers the anonymity of research participants or contravenes data protection legislation. This enables future researchers to replicate findings or re-analyse the data in the light of recent theoretical advances.

Authors should also report the source of funding for research, especially where this may conceivably have led to a perceived conflict of interest e.g., where research into the psychometric properties of a test is funded by the commercial publishers of that test.

Role of reviewers

Editors appoint external experts as peer reviewers. Their role is to evaluate the submitted paper and provide written feedback to the authors. The aim is to ensure that the published work will be as accurate, comprehensive, and scientifically valuable as possible. Reviewers and editors are placed in a position of trust during this process, and as such, must adhere to ethical standards of conduct regarding the treatment of the submitted work.

Reviewers and editors must maintain the confidentiality of the author(s) while assessing the manuscript. This would also apply should it be necessary to consult a colleague regarding a particular section of the paper.

The ownership rights of the author(s) must be respected throughout the process. To this end:

- The work should not be circulated, or quoted except as is necessary for the review.
- The permission of the author(s) must be obtained if editors or reviewers wish to use any part of the submitted manuscript (e.g. data, arguments, or interpretations) in their own work prior to publication of the paper.
- Reviewers may contact the authors via the editor after the review process is concluded.

Should reviewers suspect ethical misconduct by the author(s), following an assessment of the manuscript, or by other reviewers during the review process, they must inform the editor

in confidence. It is the responsibility of the editor to ensure that the review process is conducted according to the highest ethical standards.

References

American Psychological Association (1992). Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct. *American Psychologist*, 1597-1611.
American Psychological Association (1994) *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association.* Washington, DC: APA.
Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (1999) *Guidelines on Good Publication Practice*. London: BMA.

APPENDIX II

PURPOSE OF THE THESIS AND VIVA
Written by Prof Rob Ward

The thesis and viva are meant to answer one big question: can the candidate conduct independent high-quality research in psychology?

The answer to this question is made by two people:

- The external examiner, who is an expert in the field;
- And the internal examiner, who will be a staff member from Bangor Psychology (This will be a smart and experienced researcher whose expertise is usually related but not identical to the thesis topic).

The examiners are meant to use their professional judgement to reach this decision, and they will be looking for a range of qualities in the thesis and viva. Examiners come in all sizes and temperaments.

THE THESIS

The thesis is the main source of evidence for answering the main question about ability to do independent high-quality research. The BPS identify a number of signature qualities for the thesis, and many are the exact same things we use to assess undergraduate projects: clarity of logic and presentation, technical competence, scholarship, etc, etc. Obviously these are important, but as far as I can tell, students don't usually panic about them. The biggest obstacle, the thing students worry about the most is.....is it ENOUGH? ENOUGH experiments run, ENOUGH work completed?

CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE: Fears about ENOUGH relate mainly to what the BPS calls "contribution to knowledge". The BPS suggests the thesis should have enough research for at least two peer-reviewed articles. This guideline is incredibly specific in one sense, but in practice it is not so hard and fast. "Articles" vary a lot in the amount of work they report. Examiners are unlikely to feel that two 1000-word reports represent sufficient contribution to knowledge, even if both appeared in Psychological Science. So what constitutes an "article"? If you presented two "articles", but the examiners took real issue with one or two experiments, would there still be two "articles" left? A sensible aim if you have the material might be the equivalent of three "full" research articles in your area. This seems to reflect the expectations of many examiners, and means that mild disparity about "how many papers the thesis is worth" will not be important in

the assessment.

Importance to examiners: 5/5

PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE AND COMMUNICATION: Absolutely no surprises here, basically the exact same things we assess undergraduate projects on: are presentations of methods clear and complete; are the analyses appropriate and correct? Are conclusions correctly made and limited as appropriate? Graphs easy to read? No typos? I think we are all familiar with this kind of drill, and expectations here are high.

Importance to examiners: 5/5

COHERENCE: The BPS suggests that the thesis should be an integrated work. This isn't really just about transition paragraphs. The thesis is meant to provide evidence of research skills. Would a thesis containing two disjoint experiments do that? Even if published in top journals? Probably not. The examiners will be on the lookout for evidence of how the questions and answers raised by one study can be used to lead on to the next. This is critical for answering the main question about whether the candidate can produce independent high-quality research in psychology.

Experimental chapters can, and even should, be based largely on submitted or published papers. But, a journal article is more about presenting a "finished product" as opposed to a process. The process of research probably included lots of things that are left out of a typical journal article: false starts, extra analyses, null effects, and refinement of experiments over time.

Your thesis is a way to answer questions related to both finished product *and* process. Demonstrating the research process beyond what a journal article might require is something to consider. Especially if aspects of the work aren't publishable because the findings aren't novel, you can still demonstrate ability to ask questions and design experiments in the right ways.

Importance to examiners: Probably should be 5/5, but realistically I think the importance of coherence is being downplayed with the increasing pressure to base the thesis around submitted and published papers. Let's say 3/5 on average.

INTERESTING OUTCOMES: Not mentioned by BPS. When we review papers for publication, we assess technical quality, but also whether the outcomes are interesting enough for publication. Null effects and strange outcomes are hard to publish. However, this "interest" factor shouldn't be an issue for the thesis, and isn't meant to be, provided you went through the process like a research professional in your field. You can demonstrate your ability to do good research even if you didn't get an interesting outcome.

Importance to examiners: In an ideal world maybe this should be 0/5, but realistically, let's say 2/5. If you have lots of null results, then you will probably want to document even more clearly the reasoning behind your experiments and analyses, and how they form a coherent and sensible pattern of investigation.

WHAT WE'RE LEFT WITH.

Taking all that into consideration, the basic model covering most recent theses here at Bangor is

SOMETHING like:

A series of experimental chapters, about three "articles" (often based based closely on published or submitted work (or work in preparation for submission), sandwiched between:

- An introduction. Giving the necessary background to the topic and reviewing the relevant work.
- And a discussion. Retelling all the experimental outcomes is not really a discussion but a summary. A summary can have its place, but that isn't what this is about. This discussion has taken lots of forms in the past, including: highlighting key findings and "threads" running through the work; considering implications and applications of the work; limitations; future plans. A lot of possibilities.

All of which are well-written, analysed appropriately, described using the standards of the field, etc.

If you go this route and base chapters on work you have published or submitted elsewhere, it's a good idea to indicate this upfront, e.g., at the start of the chapter, "Experiments 1a, 1b, and 2 were previously published in Journal of Psychology (Someone & Other, 2013)". This assumes that you as the student are the first author of the submitted and published papers forming the basis of the chapter. If not, that raises serious questions about whether you should base a chapter around those papers.

THE VIVA

So if the thesis is about demonstrating that you can conduct and report high-quality research, what is the purpose of the viva?

The University guidelines address the purpose of the viva pretty well:

1. To make sure that you really are the author of the work.
2. To defend the thesis and clarify questions the examiners will have.
3. Allow the examiners to get a feel for the student's knowledge in the area of the study.

Point 1 is verifying that the thesis is your intellectual property. By "your" and "intellectual property", we mean that you know, understand, and can apply the research process that went on and is described in your thesis. It would become apparent pretty quickly if you bought your thesis online, or if your supervisor did all the writing. However, you might have incorporated feedback from your supervisor. You might have included a paper with contributions from collaborators. This is part of the normal process of science. The thesis itself is therefore some conglomeration or emergent result of the student's own work with more directed feedback and contributions from others. But a critical part of being able to conduct independent research relies on being able to form a coherent research question and design a study to answer it. So you might expect questions that aren't directly covered in the thesis, like why was an experiment designed the way it was, how do the findings fit with an alternative hypotheses. The key thing isn't necessarily whether you have a "ready" answer, but instead whether you are approaching the question in a scientific way, one that indicates you can carry out research on the question.

Points 2 and 3 are related. After reading a work as big and as complex as a thesis, the examiners will have some questions. The viva is a chance to discuss these questions with you. Sometimes an issue that is really troubling an examiner can be cleared up easily. Occasionally a small quibble reveals a larger issue once it is pursued. Pushing the ideas around can lead to new ways of thinking about the research.

The main point from the examiners' point of view is that this discussion can change their understanding of the work and the student's knowledge. This rarely changes their views about whether the thesis is acceptable, but frequently changes the revisions they might require.

This leads to the main point of the viva from the student's view. It is an educational experience for sure, in one way or another. A viva in the British system is something unique. In the US and much of Europe, the viva or thesis defense is conducted in public. Family and friends can come along to witness. The audience is looking for triumph. They aren't interested in long exchanges over the details of the research. They aren't interested in details about different potential designs and outcomes. Not that it can't happen, but few examiners want to ask scrutinising questions for more than a few minutes. It's a fine system, but I wouldn't say the viva itself is especially educational. In the British viva, you'll be sharing a room with the examiners for 1.5 - 2 hours, give or take. The examiners will have read your entire thesis and will be interested in discussing it. The viva can be a really useful experience, because you will probably never again have two experts read, critically evaluate, and discuss your research with you for two hours.

The discussion format

This discussion format is very different from a presentation format. Some places are making the viva more like a presentation and less like a discussion, for example, the student might make a powerpoint presentation to start things off. I think this is unfortunate. First, the examiners will have already read the thesis, spent hours preparing for the viva, and there are definitely some who will not be looking forward to this presentation. Second, what is there to be said about the work that can't be included in the thesis itself? Convenience of the examiners aside, my main doubt about a powerpoint presentation is that it pushes the viva away from the detailed discussion that makes the British examination unique and valuable, at least in my view. The real benefit of a powerpoint presentation is that the student knows they'll have a chance to get into "presentation mode" and calm their nerves. But that happens anyway. In literally every examination I've attended, as internal, external, or chair, the student has been asked an introductory question to get things started and to settle their nerves. For example, "can you summarise me the main findings of your thesis", or "tell me about the part of thesis you are most proud of".

So all that said about the purpose and format, I'm reluctant to give advice about something like a viva, which vary quite a bit, certainly in the topics and detail of questions. But in this case, I'll go ahead anyway! My advice is, it is much healthier and more productive to treat the viva not as an evaluation but as a discussion of your work. After several years, you'll be familiar with your work in a way the examiners can't be. On the other hand, they might pick up on some new way to look at things in your data, hypotheses, or accounts. That's totally fine, and in fact a great outcome.

The examiners might suggest an account or alternative you don't agree with. That's fine too. The aim is to consider whether there is evidence in your thesis (or elsewhere) that might relate to that account. You can argue the point, accept it, do one then change your mind, it's about whether you're considering the ideas scientifically. So a discussion. Likewise, if you're not really clear on what the examiner is asking or suggesting -- get them to clarify. You can discuss the question and what they're trying to get at. On an evaluation like an MCQ or essay you don't have this kind of luxury. But when you think of the viva as a research discussion, then asking the examiners questions makes perfect sense.

In writing about the viva, I realise there is something of a fine line between being encouraging and being scary. I want to be encouraging. Vivas are usually stressful, at least initially, but they usually end happily. The main question for the examiners is not pass or fail, but what to ask for in revision. You will make it!

What do the examiners and chair actually do during the viva?

The external examiner frequently takes the lead role in the questions. The idea is that they are well-placed to evaluate the standard of the work. But it is a weighty burden to make a judgement about a thesis. The internal examiner, although not necessarily an expert in the topic, is an experienced researcher and brings a second perspective to the evaluation. It is something like double-marking. Having two examiners serves as a valuable check and validation.

The chair: Who is this other person who sits quietly around the table and doesn't ask any questions? The chair is an experienced member of staff, someone who has seen a few vivas, and is basically there as a witness that everything proceeded in a fair and reasonable way. It's statistically unlikely that the chair will have much to do along these lines, because as far as I know, we haven't yet had a case in Psychology where the chair has had to intervene. The chair also plays a kind of liaison-type role, doing things like escorting the student from reception, and is best placed for keeping an eye out on the clock and everyone's stress levels. The chair also makes sure the paperwork is filled out and returned to Everil. However, although the position is called "chairperson", it isn't like chairing a committee meeting. The examiners, and especially the external, should feel they are in control of the viva.