Can we improve thesis data quality?
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This document examines the possibility of improved quality control for data regarding theses at KTH. There are two major places where data about 1st and 2nd cycle theses is recorded at KTH: DiVA and LADOK.

* LADOK has information about the title and alternative title of each thesis for which a grade has been assigned.
* DiVA should have the meta data for each thesis and at least an archive copy of the actual thesis.

However, a recent examination of data in these two sources reveals that there are some problems with the data quality. There are also some clear examples of people not following administrative policies (ranging from more students that permitted for a given type of thesis to incorrect covers, incorrect placement of the covers, and lack of cover and English or Swedish abstracts – since 2010, there should be an abstract or summary in each language).

.

# Status

In an effort to understand the thesis titles in preparation for the new cover that the GVS Communications unit is working on and to understand the usage of English and Swedish titles for the language committee, I wrote a program to do a query to get the titles for all degree project moments that had a project title. I then analyzed this data by year and by school.

## Looking at LADOK data

Table 1 shows the number of grades for theses by school per year and also by cycle. This data is extracted from LADOK and only considers the degree project courses that were not cancelled as of July 2021 (all early and cancelled degree project courses were not considered). Figure 1 shows this data graphically.

Table 2 shows the percentage of grades for which the title and the alternative title matching (i.e., they are the same character string – which should be unlikely as one should be the title in Swedish and the other the title in English – and *vise versa*). Figure 2 shows this data graphically.

There is inconsistent used of “-“ and “.” To separate the title from subtitle in the LADOK titles.

Table : Data from LADOK

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | School | Number of grades for a project with a title | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | total |  |
| 1 | ABE | 1 | 10 | 35 | 277 | 269 | 295 | 361 | 390 | 390 | 318 | 351 | 466 | 446 | 472 | 300 | 4381 |  |
| 1 | CBH | 0 | 16 | 27 | 113 | 163 | 226 | 201 | 188 | 204 | 237 | 225 | 257 | 245 | 261 | 207 | 2570 |  |
| 1 | EECS | 0 | 8 | 12 | 265 | 314 | 341 | 369 | 429 | 412 | 427 | 466 | 490 | 488 | 496 | 457 | 4974 |  |
| 1 | ITM | 0 | 157 | 162 | 377 | 526 | 485 | 431 | 442 | 469 | 481 | 471 | 452 | 456 | 345 | 321 | 5575 |  |
| 1 | SCI | 0 | 94 | 109 | 174 | 173 | 215 | 238 | 249 | 268 | 293 | 266 | 296 | 244 | 187 | 210 | 3016 |  |
|  | total | 1 | 285 | 345 | 1206 | 1445 | 1562 | 1600 | 1698 | 1743 | 1756 | 1779 | 1961 | 1879 | 1761 | 1495 | 20516 |  |
| 2 | ABE | 7 | 120 | 209 | 245 | 377 | 414 | 420 | 379 | 378 | 393 | 429 | 470 | 413 | 486 | 246 | 4986 |  |
| 2 | CBH | 0 | 37 | 81 | 118 | 141 | 186 | 165 | 184 | 176 | 191 | 177 | 227 | 194 | 218 | 150 | 2245 |  |
| 2 | EECS | 2 | 79 | 109 | 132 | 131 | 216 | 219 | 218 | 286 | 426 | 543 | 594 | 635 | 730 | 328 | 4648 |  |
| 2 | ITM | 2 | 107 | 262 | 406 | 408 | 578 | 634 | 615 | 616 | 622 | 658 | 689 | 727 | 641 | 383 | 7348 |  |
| 2 | SCI | 0 | 38 | 89 | 116 | 122 | 185 | 221 | 253 | 284 | 282 | 322 | 411 | 387 | 392 | 230 | 3332 |  |
|  | total | 11 | 381 | 750 | 1017 | 1179 | 1579 | 1659 | 1649 | 1740 | 1914 | 2129 | 2391 | 2356 | 2467 | 1337 | 22559 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | grand total | 12 | 666 | 1095 | 2223 | 2624 | 3141 | 3259 | 3347 | 3483 | 3670 | 3908 | 4352 | 4235 | 4228 | 2832 | 43075 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

Figure : Number of theses per year (first and second cylce)

Table : Title and alternative title in LADOK entries

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | School | Fraction of projects with titles that match | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  |
|  |  | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | median | last 5yr median | |
| 1 | ABE |  |  | 2.86% | 24.91% | 1.49% | 4.75% | 4.16% | 6.15% | 6.15% | 7.55% | 12.82% | 10.09% | 6.28% | 8.05% | 5.67% | 6.15% | 8.05% |  |
| 1 | CBH |  |  | 11.11% | 31.86% | 19.02% | 15.49% | 20.40% | 24.47% | 24.51% | 23.21% | 23.11% | 21.79% | 1.22% | 0.77% | 0.48% | 20.40% | 1.22% |  |
| 1 | EECS |  |  | 41.67% | 39.25% | 10.19% | 39.30% | 41.46% | 59.21% | 55.58% | 28.10% | 33.91% | 21.02% | 33.81% | 37.50% | 43.76% | 39.25% | 33.91% |  |
| 1 | ITM |  | 17.83% | 12.96% | 10.88% | 11.22% | 15.67% | 32.02% | 19.46% | 17.48% | 21.62% | 24.84% | 25.66% | 40.35% | 17.68% | 17.13% | 17.76% | 24.84% |  |
| 1 | SCI |  | 36.17% | 7.34% | 37.93% | 54.91% | 46.98% | 45.80% | 41.77% | 45.15% | 37.20% | 49.25% | 10.47% | 22.13% | 6.95% | 38.10% | 38.01% | 22.13% |  |
|  | median |  | 27.00% | 11.11% | 31.86% | 11.22% | 15.67% | 32.02% | 24.47% | 24.51% | 23.21% | 24.84% | 21.02% | 22.13% | 8.05% | 17.13% | 22.67% |  |  |
| 2 | ABE |  | 43.33% | 71.29% | 53.88% | 42.71% | 43.96% | 27.62% | 28.76% | 26.46% | 28.24% | 38.00% | 45.32% | 46.00% | 40.95% | 18.70% | 42.71% | 40.95% |  |
| 2 | CBH |  | 70.27% | 70.37% | 58.47% | 38.30% | 29.03% | 19.39% | 21.74% | 28.98% | 26.70% | 24.86% | 33.04% | 32.47% | 31.65% | 29.33% | 30.49% | 31.65% |  |
| 2 | EECS |  | 87.34% | 87.16% | 79.55% | 74.81% | 75.00% | 62.56% | 53.21% | 43.71% | 51.17% | 57.09% | 54.55% | 59.69% | 57.40% | 55.18% | 57.40% | 57.09% |  |
| 2 | ITM |  | 50.47% | 63.74% | 67.49% | 51.96% | 59.00% | 54.42% | 51.22% | 51.79% | 46.30% | 46.35% | 45.57% | 39.34% | 29.80% | 17.75% | 50.47% | 39.34% |  |
| 2 | SCI |  | 97.37% | 96.63% | 79.31% | 61.48% | 68.65% | 70.14% | 72.33% | 58.45% | 51.06% | 45.65% | 47.93% | 52.45% | 42.86% | 26.09% | 59.96% | 45.65% |  |
|  | median |  | 70.27% | 71.29% | 67.49% | 51.96% | 59.00% | 54.42% | 51.22% | 43.71% | 46.30% | 45.65% | 45.57% | 46.00% | 40.95% | 26.09% | 46.30% |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

Figure : Matching title and alternative title

## Looking at DiVA data

The EECS numbers about matching titles from LADOK looked odd, as the number that did not have an English and a Swedish title had been going down until ~2015. So I looked closed at the results for 2020 using the data in DiVA and the full text thesis from DiVA when it was available (I could not look at the 2021 set, since many of the 2021 theses are not in DiVA yet). There are quite a lot of errors and omissions --- as you can see in the data at <https://kth.box.com/s/uucr9g4nq1r5zs5jg6isr4eyvrsd3a4y>

Table 3 shows the results of checking whether the matching titles in LADOK matches the data in DiVA. This examination of the theses that had matching title in LAODK considered the meta data in DiVA (during 2019) and the meta data in DiVA and the actual thesis itself (2020). As we can see, in 2020 roughly 9.4% of the cases of the 601 theses with matching titles in LADOK do **not** reflect the data in DiVA or in the thesis itself. While in the case of 2019, roughly 2.2% of the theses with matching titles in LADOK do not have matching titles in DiVA’s meta data. I think that we can consider the case illustrated by 2019 data as representing a lower bound on the errors in titles, while the data from 2020 is probably more representative of the actual titles. Additionally, it should be noted that of the 600 theses with matching titles in LADOK in 2020, 11 of these theses do not have any record in DiVA (i.e., there is no entry for this thesis – not even the meta data)! To theses claim to have full text, but I got an error about not being able to load the plugin when attempting to view the file. The full text was missing for an additional 14 theses. There theses have duplicates in DiVA:

as URN: urn:nbn:se:kth:diva-291546 and URN: urn:nbn:se:kth:diva-294066

as URN: urn:nbn:se:kth:diva-273926 and URN: urn:nbn:se:kth:diva-273266

as URN: urn:nbn:se:kth:diva-289523 and URN: urn:nbn:se:kth:diva-290794

One 1st cycle thesis has the correct Swedish title for one author, but not the other author! In one case DiVA shows the English title again as the alternative title! In two cases the inside cover page shows the Swedish title says: ": Detta är den svenska översättningen av titeln”, i.e., the student used the new template but did not enter a Swedish title; hence they got the detault text – and the examiner did not seem to have noticed! In one case, DiVA says the report is in Swedish, but it is in English and only has a title in English. In one case, the abstracts in English and Swedish are in the PDF but missing in DiVA.

In one case the thesis has a Swedish sammananfaning before the abstract although the text is in English. In one case the absracts follow TOC. In another case, the abstracts and keywords are numbered as sections and subsections. In some cases the Swedish sammanfatning is missing.

Additionally, there are quite a number of cases where the cover is incorrect. Of these three have used a Swedish cover but the thesis is actually in English. One thesis has both current and older covers! In a number of cases it is clear that the cover is not correct with strings such as:

* "KTH Thesis Report" on cover (3x),
* "KTH Master Thesis Report" (3x),
* "KTH Master Thesis" (1x),
* "Master Thesis Project" (2x)
* "KTH Bachelor Thesis Report" (2x), and
* "KTH Thesis Report" (2x).

In at least 4 cases there is a back cover as the 2nd page in the PDF file. In one case the Swedish keywords are actually English words. In 8 cases there are spelling errors in the title.

Table : Does the DiVA data support the LADOK matching titles

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2020** |  |  |
| 460 | accurate | 0.375204 |
| 115 | FALSE | 0.093801 |
| 1226 | total |  |
|  |  |  |
| **2019** |  |  |
| 0 | accurate | 0 |
| 25 | FALSE | 0.022262 |
| 1123 | total |  |
|  |  |  |

# Could one exploit the DiVA data to check the quality of the LADOK data?

As we saw in the previous section by looking at the DiVA metadata it was possible to identify that some of the claimed matching titles were in fact not matching. This suggests that perhaps the DiVA metadata could be used to check the accuracy of the LADOK titles. However, this is not actually easy to do. The problem is that one needs an identifier that is available in both LADOK and DiVA and there is no such identifier. Moreover, we cannot use the author’s name as the author names are not consistent between LADOK and DiVA.

However, it is possible to translate the LADOK identifier for a student to a KTH ID (here after kthid) – as this joint mapping is in Canvas. So if the DiVA entries have the kthid for the author or authors entered, then it would be possible to match the entries for the title entered with the grades in LADOK with the DiVA entry. However, as we can see in Table 4 the fraction of authors whose kthid was entered is too low to use this as a means to associate a LADOK title entry with a DiVA entry.

So it would appear that we do **not** have a simple means of connecting the two data sources, unless:

* The DiVA administrators **enter the kthid for authors** and/or
* Some sort of fuzzy matching is done on author names and titles.

Table : Number of DiVA entries with KTHDIs for the authors

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Some statistics for KTH from DiVA data about the number of student theses, with number of authors, and number of KTHIDs for these authors (data is take from DiVA on 2021-07-25) | | | | | | | | |
| ABE theses with authors and KTHIDs | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Totals | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|  | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |  | students |  |  |  |
| author0 | 646 | 725 | 382 |  | ABE | 862 | 1016 | 521 |
| author1 | 214 | 290 | 138 |  | CBH | 225 | 376 | 156 |
| author2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | EECS | 1064 | 1186 | 146 |
|  |  |  |  |  | ITM | 991 | 900 | 392 |
| with KTHIDs |  |  |  |  | SCI | 510 | 512 | 220 |
| author0 | 8 | 4 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author1 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| percentage of authors with KTHIDs | 1.16% | 0.39% | 4.22% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CBH theses with authors and KTHIDs | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | KTHIDs | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|  | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |  | ABE | 10 | 4 | 22 |
| author0 | 176 | 290 | 118 |  | CBH | 11 | 14 | 2 |
| author1 | 49 | 68 | 37 |  | EECS | 21 | 7 | 0 |
| author2 | 0 | 11 | 1 |  | ITM | 14 | 3 | 0 |
| author3 | 0 | 7 | 0 |  | SCI | 3 | 2 | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| with KTHIDs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| author0 | 7 | 12 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author1 | 4 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| percentage of authors with KTHIDs | 4.89% | 3.79% | 1.28% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EECS theses with authors and KTHIDs | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author0 | 846 | 954 | 140 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author1 | 218 | 230 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author2 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| with KTHIDs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| author0 | 15 | 4 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author1 | 6 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author2 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| percentage of authors with KTHIDs | 1.97% | 0.59% | 0.00% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITM theses with authors and KTHIDs | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author0 | 664 | 604 | 231 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author1 | 320 | 290 | 152 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author2 | 7 | 6 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| with KTHIDs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| author0 | 9 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author1 | 4 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| percentage of authors with KTHIDs | 1.41% | 0.33% | 0.00% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SCI theses with authors and KTHIDs | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author0 | 395 | 394 | 157 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author1 | 114 | 118 | 63 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| with KTHIDs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| author0 | 3 | 2 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| author2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| percentage of authors with KTHIDs | 0.59% | 0.39% | 4.55% |  |  |  |  |  |

# How can you get the data and reproduce the results?

You can retrieve the DiVA data with commands of the form:

wget -O cbh-2019-diva.mods 'https://kth.diva-portal.org/smash/export.jsf?format=mods&addFilename=true&aq=[[]]&aqe=[]&aq2=[[{"dateIssued":{"from":"2019","to":"2019"}},{"organisationId":"879224","organisationId-Xtra":true},{"publicationTypeCode":["studentThesis"]}]]&onlyFullText=false&noOfRows=2000&sortOrder=title\_sort\_asc&sortOrder2=title\_sort\_asc'

Followed by extracting the authors, titles, etc. using a command of the form:

./MODS\_to\_titles\_and\_subtitles.py --mods abe-2021-diva.mods

The organization IDs are:

diva\_L1\_code={

'ABE': "5850",

'ITM': "6023",

'SCI': "6091",

'CBH': "879224",

'EECS': "879223"

}

One can get the LADOK data for degree project with a command of the form:

./thesis\_titles\_by\_school.py -s EECS

All of the programs are available from <https://github.com/gqmaguirejr/E-learning>