

## Chapter 4 Equity groups and statistical parameters

This is hard because the examiner simply doesn't like what I have to say, here.

### SECTION 4.1

- **DONE** 'as' First sentence: perhaps "people as members of groups" or "people qua members of groups"?

p. 93 "In this chapter I will introduce different notions of kinds or ways of defining groups and settle on the notion of a statistical parameter that is currently employed in a variety of contexts including economics,..." "Explain why you are doing this and how it helps develop the overall thesis.

I think I have done this.

- There is a clear introductory paragraph at the start of the chapter. However, I have altered sentence two 'In this chapter I will introduce different notions of kinds or ways of defining groups on the basis of different features that are defining of group membership. I will then settle on the notion of a statistical parameter that is agnostic on stabilising mechanism and can be defined however the researcher likes in the search for strength of association'
- Broke the paragraph into two because it was getting long.

At the end of section 4.1 I have cut what was previously the last paragraph short and added one immediately after:

"In this section we have considered different views of kinds: mathematically defined, natural kinds, evolutionary kinds, social kinds, nominal kinds, and disjunctive kinds. Each of these had a different notion of what stabilised members of the kind as members of the kind, or, in other words, a different notion of what was essential for something to count as a member of the kind. The point of this section has been to introduce something of the range of views that has been held for scientific or quasi-scientific kinds in the history of philosophy. Let us now turn to kinds of people, more particularly, before I go on to introduce something of the range of equity groups that have typically been considered. This chapter will end with the notion of a statistical parameter and the idea of getting rich betting on likely futures for people on the basis of their statistical parameters / equity group memberships'.

Ex 1 and I are united on the section "Kinds of kinds" – you don't show why this is relevant, and you need to either cut it or contextualise it so that the reader can see why you're talking about it.

Keep your potential audience in mind when you do this. This section is very poorly referenced, with little supporting evidence offered in support of some claims.

- to paragraph 4 on 'kinds of kinds' I have added references to Kripke and Putnam

## SECTION 4.2

As above, explain clearly at the start how this relates to the rest of the thesis and provide evidence and references to support claims. I hope the revised introduction addresses this.

The initial argument in this section is poor. To reach the conclusion, you need an argument that links merit to justified inequality. Removed reference to inequality thus removing need for argument. This isn't an argument. It is laying the issues out as I said I would at the start of the chapter.

DONE "that we focus on who the primary beneficiaries are." This approach is a decent one and adds originality to the work.

p. 93 "We have considered already that the World Health Organisation considered what was common to equity groups was lack of power to obtain health and health outcomes..." This is not an accurate restatement of the information on p. 78. 'Lack of political, social, or economic power' was 'a characteristic common to groups that experience health inequities'. I do not see how that is inaccurate.

p. 99 Matheson and Dew quote: It would be preferable to argue for this and, in a sense, make the claims your own, by providing evidence in the inequality and equity chapter, then refer back to it here. I made the claim my own by rephrasing things in my own words in the next paragraph. I have other evidence / quotes in the previous chapter.

4.2.1 Biological sex, gender, sexual orientation, marital status: As above, explain the relevance of the section right at the start, both to the thesis as a whole and to this chapter. 'Let us now briefly consider some of the equity groups that have been proposed in the New Zealand context. Note that this involves our identifying not who profits from the way that things are, but rather identification of the current victims of inequality page 102.'

The claims from "In the absence of SRY..." The claims in this section are misleading, arguably offensive, and show no understanding of Swyer Syndrome or Androgen Insensitivity Syndrome. This is the standard line that science students are taught. I provided reference to a standard text. The text does not mention either of those. I suppose because they are very rare / of esoteric interest, for the most part.

p. 100-104 provide evidence and references to support claims.<sup>[SEP]</sup>p. 102: It would be preferable to use a primary source rather than Rashbrooke. I have added references

p. 102: “it does not seem to be the case that pay increases (across all fields) primarily benefited women.” Use statistics to back up claims like this. I am talking about the analysis of the statistics that we saw previously in Chapter 2. Now I am linking things back that the examiner faults me for not adding new content!

p. 103 “It is a lot where biological difference (the fact that women bear children and not men and women lactate and not men) has a significant impact, indeed, on the sort of future a woman can have. It is important not to undervalue the role of access to birth control for women when it comes to the empowerment of women to futures that are not inexorably tied to inequalities of biology.” Good, but restructure your work to tie all this together. Why do I need to restructure? Refer to the table of contents and / or the introduction and / or the introductory portion at the start of this chapter. There are 3 different places that converge on providing a clear and succinct statement of the structure that is actually there, in my thesis.

4.2.2 Racial ancestry, ethnicity, skin colour: The start to this section is better than 4.2.1, but the way on which it ties the thesis together could still be improved. We are in a section ‘kinds of people’ in a chapter on ‘equity groups’ and we are working our way through them, sequentially.

p. 105 paragraph beginning “There used to be...”: provide evidence and reference claims.

p. 105: “People are often asked to state which ethnic groups they identify as being a member of on forms, for example.” This is a poor example. There are good examples that relate directly to the thesis – choose one of those. And this is a throwaway comment that is wasting my time.

p. 106-107: Provide evidence and references Done

p. 107: “This is why the New Zealand Government is supposed to...” This is one reason why it is done. That doesn’t mean it is the only reason it is done. I didn’t say it was the ONLY reason

4.2.3 Geographical mesh block: provide references and explain the relevance to the thesis within the section. I provided a reference from Statistics New Zealand (who defined the notion). I stated ‘inequality in geography has typically been about the differences in life changes between people of high vs low income countries... More recently we have the notion of a ‘smallest geographical unit or grid of space’... This occurs in a section that is listing the different equity groups in a New Zealand context.

#### 4.2.4 Poverty and the NZDep score

“There has been fairly surprising reluctance to consider poverty to be an equity group.”: Provide evidence to support this claim. I can’t reference what is not there. There is a dearth of literature on the issue is my point. People have not focused on poverty as an equity group.

“because more of them experience poverty,” Provide evidence – this claim conflicts with my past research. More Maaori experience poverty is a claim that conflicts with your past research? Reference added.

p. 109 The claims in this paragraph need evidence and referencing. End the section by linking it back to the overall argument in the thesis.

Added: Now we have considered both the range of different theories of kinds or group membership and the range of different equity groups that have been considered in New Zealand and overseas contexts. We will now turn to the notion of a statistical parameter which has been used to define or measure equity group membership and associations between members and various features including proxies for health and wealth.

#### 4.2.5 Disability

“Prevailing theories of economics don't consider...”: support this with references to these theories. It is hard to reference what is not there, again.

“People with disability have worse health outcomes”: This is ambiguous depending on what is meant by “disability” and “health outcome” – link this back to the discussion in chapter 1. People with disability have lives DALY’s ranked lower. We saw that in Chapter 1.

“Economic theories focus on DALYs...” ALL economic theories? Did I say ALL economic theories? What would a charitable reading be, here?

“largely the result of how we treat people with disability.” This varies depending on what the disability is. Aim to be more clear and precise. That said, the example of deafness is a good one and the points made are worth making. It might be worth making more of deafness and equity as an issue within the thesis. I am considering disability in general in this thesis. Disability is broad, as the examiner notes. That is why it has been considered a political kind where what is common has to do with the power thing (as I in fact point out in my thesis). I want to consider it in generality and not spend too much time in particular cases (e.g., deafness)

#### 4.3 Statistical parameters

p. 113 “We have also learned that there are dangers extrapolating from adult age blocks...”: good, but add a reference or three. **DONE**

p. 113 “intending to obscure discovery of difference in Māori populations in order to further benefit non-Māori New Zealanders”: I can’t find where the source cited states or implies that this is the case. If there is evidence to support the claim, provide it. If not, delete it. **Fixed reference.**

p. 114-115 add references to the quotes. **Fixed.**

p. 116: “This explains why some people do not think that disability is or can be a group of equity consideration.”: Provide supporting evidence and explain further. **The quote is the supporting evidence in which I make my claim.**

p. 117 paragraph starting “The ‘General... “ It would be clearer just to include the figure if that is possible.

p. 117 “We know that generally it is poor people and people who don't have the power to hide from data collectors that are the subjects for data collection. Poor people are rather more well studied than rich people....” Provide referenced evidence to back up claims. Introduce the possibility that if some types of study are carried out more frequently on those from lower socio-economic groups, that could be because they are recognised as needing help.” **One idea is they are recognized as needing help. That is supposed to be what justifies it. Has that led to them being helped? We previously considered the trajectory. It appears as though it is more often the case that the data is used by other to help themselves, at the expense of those who are the objects of the study.**

p. 117 “The World Health Organisation considered that what equity groups have in common is that they lack the power to access health / the resources needed to access health.”: This doesn’t fairly represent the information given earlier in the thesis. Back the claim up by with evidence. **‘a characteristic common to groups that experience health inequities... is lack of political, social or economic power.’ Paragraph 3 WHO n.d. ‘Health inequities therefore involve more than inequality to with respect to health determinants, access to the resources needed to improve and maintain health or health outcomes...’ paragraph 1 WHO n.d. Reference added.**

pp. 117-118: Who makes the claims given here, where are they made and what evidence supports them? Some of the claims here just seem false – try looking on google scholar for supporting evidence. **I have tidied up this paragraph, referred back to previous sections and deleted a claim**

#### 4.4 Capitation funding and assessment of risk

p. 119 “First-Contact, Services to Improve Access, Health Promotion, and Care Plus.” These need explaining. ‘we will go on to see how they explain these notions’ added.

p. 119 bottom of page, this long quote needs indenting and referencing. I don’t see this one.

p. 121: indent long quotes. Yes, I believe I have done this Explain that Services to Improve Access is abbreviated as SIA before using “SIA”. Done Explain “Care Plus” I say it is a ‘formula’ which is all we need. Explain the section that begins “ In support of this...” more clearly. Add an end quote to the p. 137 quote. Ideally, rework this paragraph so that it is more your own work and less a series of quotes. What reworking I have done the examiner claims is not accurate. That is why I keep the lengthy quotes. So people like the examiner can go back to a more careful reading of the quote that I have provided when they are assessing the accuracy of my paraphrasing / reworking.

pp. 121-122. Quote at the bottom of the page. Start off the quote by explaining what you are doing in this section and why the quote is relevant. Integrate the quote into the overall argument. I do go on to analyse the quotes

p. 122: Explain what “morbidity-based risk adjustment” is. I think this is common sense – an adjustment to risk on the basis of morbidity Add and end quote to the quote that starts ‘most risk adjustment... and add a reference.

p. 123 paragraph beginning “Improving.... ” This paragraph and argument needs an overhaul. Add references to back up claims. Reference provided

“that explicitly says it is focusing on collecting data that is cheap”: add a reference and evidence. Crampton & Foley say something almost like this on p. 121 in your thesis, but they don’t say that the focus is “on collecting data that is cheap”, this has quite different connotations that need supporting with evidence. I quoted them saying: ‘cheap to collect’ They state this.

“Potential downfalls of doing this were thought to be that race and socio-economic based funding schemes are that there is additional administrative complexity and costs and leaves a large proportion of differences in spending unexplained. In other words, there is the potential for administrators to make a lot of money off of this bounty that has been placed on certain individual's heads.” (sic): Provide evidence and a reference here. The second sentence makes a claim that has been very poorly argued for. I rephrasing what I quoted. ‘Bounty on their heads’

aka 'per capita allowance'

"Nobody seems to be expecting them to actually improve health outcomes - the extra money is because of past injustices.": this is a false dichotomy and is not supported by evidence. The quote says clearly 'weightings were applied to the Care Plus formula so as not to perpetuate historical inequities'. The quote says 'these groups seek care at rates similar to the rest of the population despite being sicker'.

"There does not appear to be any accountability on how the money is supposed to help the supposed primary beneficiaries." No good evidence was given to support this claim. The quote says clearly that there is little accountability on how the money is spent.

"The primary beneficiaries appear to be administrators." No good argument was given to support this claim. The quote says clearly that the primary beneficiaries are administrators.

"The authors refer specifically to the third article with reference to 'equal rights' for Māori as being a relevant part of the Treaty, but they make no reference to the United Nations or to the Declaration of Human Rights that provides the contractual grounding for the Treaty.": Provide evidence to support this claim. Provide evidence that they make no reference? I cannot reference something that is not there.

p. 124 ff argument by Towns, Watkins, et al. 2004. Given that the target is the government's current system, examining the government's current system and the justification given for it seems more relevant. I have talked about the historical inequity justification Or, if you want to use secondary sources, it would be preferable to find a more recent one. I want this one because of the NZMJ connection (these guys are students presumably writing about what they learn in their medical curriculum) The connection to insurance gets off track, and I haven't commented on this in the notes below. For example, the government collects funds that are used for health based on income, not on pre-existing conditions. There isn't much point discussing insurance companies and their justification for charging more. Higher insurance premiums and higher capitation funding are very different things. I don't believe they are, particularly I do mention below that it is important to provide evidence to back up the claims that you make that there is no need to give DHBs with higher numbers of Māori more health care funding because providing Māori with decent health care is not more expensive than providing health care to European NZers. Oh – was the money to be spent on PROVIDING healthcare to Māori. I did not see evidence of that. They don't go to their GP's more than non-Māori, remember. They are sicker, but they don't seek treatment at higher rates. The difference in spending was 'unexplained'. The

clinics get more money for having more Maaori enrolled in them – not for actually treating them.

p. 125 “The authors do not consider ethical principles such as Māori being persons with right to health.” (sic) I don’t understand the argument here. They are utilitarian and not rights based in their understanding of WHY we should be equitable

p. 126 “I didn't choose my pre-existing risk” This isn’t relevant to insurance companies. It isn’t relevant to people who unlawfully discriminate against people on the basis of their race or gender or whatever either. It is relevant to issues of morality and fairness.

p. 126 “people tend to think that it is okay to discriminate against people when it comes to calculation of health insurance premiums”: they probably don’t think of this as discrimination at all – there needs to be an argument to claim that it is. I don’t understand the problem, here. Do you agree it is not acceptable to pay someone less solely because of their race, gender, disability? Do you think it is acceptable to charge someone higher insurance premiums solely because of their race, gender, disability? It seems to me both are equally unacceptably discriminatory. I can’t see a relevant difference.

p. 126 “this results in certain groups in our society bearing a disproportionate amount of the burden, or of others exploiting them for their own personal gain”: I disagree – this claim seems to be based on a misunderstanding of how the insurance system works. To keep this claim in, add an argument explaining why people with my view are incorrect. What is the relevant difference you see?

pp. 126-127 “For now, the role of the government is to legislate against discrimination so that it is not a feature of the private nor public sector, and not appeal to its use in the private sector as precedent for them to employ similar, discriminatory practices.” (sic): This is not what is happening. The idea is that both occur because of the costs of health care to these groups and their greater needs.

p. 127 “I do not know whether or not Brash denied or attempted to minimise these later things.” (sic) Read Brash so that you do know. In OTHER SPEECHES I mean. I am not going to read everything Brash has ever said.

pp. 127-128 paragraph beginning “What were the... “ Only one source was used to support these claims, and the stated reasons for the extra funding were not sufficiently examined. Provide evidence that Māori don’t require extra funding for GP services, for example. I provided the quote that showed that the extra funding wasn’t going to be spent on the provision of extra health



services for Maaori. The differences in spending was largely ‘unexplained’. Remove the emotive word use from this paragraph and add references.

## JUSTINES COMMENTS:

### Chapter Four comments

- First sentence: perhaps “people as members of groups” or “people qua members of groups”? **yep fixed**
- Ex 1 and I are united on the section “Kinds of kinds” – you don’t show why this is relevant, and you need to either cut it or contextualise it so that the reader can see why you’re talking about it. **I tried to do that in the intro**
- Ex 1 comment on pp100-104 referencing: you have fixed this. **done**
- Ex1 comment on p 105 (now p103): they ask you to provide evidence and references, and you haven’t yet. (on both of the paras that begin “There used to be...” ) **done to both paragraphs**
- The example of being asked what you identify as on forms: I’m not sure why Ex1 thinks this is a bad example, **he wanted the page references and he really (really really) seemed not to believe me when it came to ethnicity coders re-coding. I have provided the evidence. It is true.** though I do think your discussion of it isn’t all that helpful. What forms? Health forms. All the freaking survey forms that people need to fill out every five freaking minutes if they present to public anything in this country (hospitals, GP offices, work and income, stats nz surveys, census forms) If we’re talking about the census form, the controversy about whether NZer is an ethnicity does exist, but not amongst anyone sensible who understands the purpose of the question (planning resource-provision for things that genuinely do correlate with ethnicity properly construed). **It is controversial, actually. I have the reference fixed up, now. There is a case to be made (that I made) about Maaori being people and also being New Zealanders (if they choose they want to work towards this country the way people do in identifying with being Australians and Candadians and Americans – all the people of the country of all the races. There isn’t anything racist about people identifying their nationality as their ethnicity in any other freaking country but this one). It is also controversial what ethnicity ‘properly construed’ is. Here we have coders reclassifying people who have self-reported their ethnicity. What do they want? A bio sample to get it right? Ancestry verification? Vote from the tribe?**
- Ex 1’s comments on (page numbers from October version) pp106 – 107 and 4.2.3 haven’t been addressed. **I thnk this is done now**
- 4.2.4. Your extra bit added to “There has been fairly surprising reluctance to consider poverty to be an equity group” doesn’t seem to me to address Ex 1’s point – you seem to have provided evidence that if there is reluctance, the reluctance is surprisig, but not what I think they are after, which is references

showing that there is reluctance. I can't reference what isn't there. People don't talk about it / write about it as such. That's my point.

- Ex 1's comments on the last para before 4.3 haven't been addressed: evidence and referencing; linking back to overall argument. I think I have done
- Ex 1s comment on 4.2.5 haven't been addressed. Ditto
- Actually, hardly any of Ex1's comments on the rest of this chapter have been addressed. I think they're helpful comments, and you should go through them making revisions in response to them. Yep
- Former p126 (using page numbers in cases where the examiner does, so you know which of the examiner's comments I'm talking about): Ex 1's comment about how people probably don't see what insurance companies do as discrimination at all ties in to Ex2s comment about explaining what you mean by discrimination – insurance companies, Ex 1 is suggesting, treat people differently on relevant grounds, and if so, this is not discrimination in any sense that is morally problematic. (See my comment on this wrt one of the earlier chapters – I can't remember which.)

If black people get their stuff stolen more than white people then it is racist to charge black people more for theft insurance? I would say yes. I don't see how it is different from not letting a black kid in the school because the kid won't likely do as well as a white kid. Which would be racist. I genuinely do not see how charging people different premiums on the basis of race, gender etc is not discriminating against people on the basis of race, gender etc. The companies could alter their practices in the way they calculate premiums so the risk is more fairly distributed in society.