

Te Mata Kairangi School of Graduate Research
The University of Waikato
Private Bag 3105
Hamilton 3240, New Zealand
Phone +64 7 838 5096
Email SGR@waikato.ac.nz
www.waikato.ac.nz/students/research-degrees/



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

15 October 2018

Dear [REDACTED],

Re: Examination of Higher Degree Thesis for the University of Waikato

Thank you for agreeing to act as an external examiner for the University of Waikato.

Please find enclosed

- A softbound copy of the student's thesis
- A copy of the relevant degree regulations
- An information sheet outlining the University of Waikato requirements for external examiners
- An examiner's recommendation form

Once you have examined the thesis, please forward your report and completed examiner's recommendation form to me. Please do not send a copy of your report or recommendation to any of the other participants in the examination process. We shall distribute the reports when required.

On behalf of the University of Waikato I extend my thanks for your willingness to assist with the examination of this candidate, and I look forward to receiving your report and recommendation within 6 weeks of receiving this package.

Kind regards

Janey McLean
Te Mata Kairangi School of Graduate Research
University of Waikato

Information Sheet for External Examiners of Higher Degrees

- Types of Degrees

Master of Philosophy (MPhil) Degree

The MPhil degree has a status higher than that of a first masters degree but lower than that of a PhD degree. It is a research degree designed to recognise a significant original contribution to knowledge. The degree is awarded without honours. It is intended that an MPhil thesis be the product of a minimum of one year of full time research. The original contribution to knowledge will therefore be of lesser proportions than that which would be expected in a three year Doctoral thesis.

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) Degree

The PhD degree is a wholly research degree designed to recognise a significant original contribution to knowledge. The PhD thesis is the product of a minimum of three years of full time research. The degree is awarded without honours. Within the PhD programme, a candidate may submit their thesis under one of three variants, by thesis, 'with publication' or 'with creative practice component'. The candidate is required to indicate at the time of submission which variant they have used, and additional information is provided for examiners in these cases.

Doctor of Musical Arts (DMA) Degree

The DMA degree is a research degree in which the research component is divided equally between research-based performance and a supporting thesis. The DMA thesis will be conceptually related to the student's performance interests. The qualification requires a minimum of three years full time study.

Doctor of Education (EdD) Degree

The EdD is a structured programme, consisting of course work, weighted at one third, followed by a thesis weighted at two-thirds of the total workload, time allocation and assessment. The thesis is an original research project that makes a significant contribution to the knowledge and understanding of professional practice in education. The EdD requires a minimum of three years of full time enrolment.

Doctor of Juridical Science (SJD) Degree

The SJD is a structured programme, consisting of course work, weighted at one third, followed by a thesis weighted at two-thirds of the total workload, time allocation and assessment. The thesis is an original research project that makes a significant contribution to the knowledge and understanding of professional practice in law. The SJD requires a minimum of three years of full time enrolment.

- The Examination Process

Examiners of all Higher Degrees are asked to concern themselves particularly with the quality of the original research work undertaken, together with the general argument of the thesis.

Examiner's Report

There is no standard format for the examiner's written report, but usually it includes an assessment of whether:

- the candidate shows appropriate familiarity with, and understanding of, the relevant literature;
- the thesis clearly sets out a research aim, hypothesis or initial intention;
- the thesis provides a sufficiently comprehensive study of the topic;
- the research methodologies are appropriate and adequate for the subject matter and are properly applied;
- the research findings are suitably analysed, set out, and accompanied by adequate exposition;
- the quality of language, expression, and general presentation of the thesis is satisfactory;
- the thesis as a whole makes an original contribution to the knowledge of the subject with which it deals, and whether the candidate understands the relationship between the content of the thesis and the wider context of knowledge to which it belongs;
- there are any parts of the thesis which, in the opinion of the examiners, are worthy of being the basis of a publication.

The report should conclude with a recommendation as to whether the thesis should be accepted as fulfilling the requirements for the degree. This is summarised on the Examiner's Recommendation form. The recommendation may be unequivocal, or may be qualified by requiring:

- a) satisfactory answers to particular questions at an oral examination ; or
- b) major or minor amendments to the text of the thesis.

An examiner may suggest that corrections and/or additional explanations should be incorporated into the text or included in an addendum to the thesis. Where a thesis is unsatisfactory in some major aspect but the research could potentially make a significant contribution to knowledge, an examiner may recommend that it be revised for re-examination.

In the case of doctorate degrees, the report should include an outline of any questions which the examiner thinks should be put to the candidate at the oral examination.

Timeframe for the Examination Report

The School of Graduate Research at the University of Waikato attempts to arrange an oral examination (if appropriate) within three (3) months of the submission of the thesis for examination. For this reason, the School normally allows six (6) weeks for the preparation of the examiner's reports. Examiners are asked to indicate their willingness to work within this timeframe before the thesis is sent to them.

Appointment of examiners

Based on the recommendation of the candidate's Faculty, the Postgraduate Research Committee appoints two external examiners. One examiner is based in either New Zealand or Australia and considered the local examiner, the other is based overseas and can be from Australia. Examiners are asked to read the thesis and make a recommendation of whether or not the thesis should proceed to oral examination. Along with their recommendation they are asked to provide a written report which will be used in a later stage of the examination process.

Upon receiving the examiners' recommendations and reports, the Postgraduate Research Committee considers how the examination will proceed. Where the examiners are in agreement the examination proceeds as recommended by the examiners. If the examiners' recommendations are divergent, a third

examiner is appointed by the Postgraduate Research Committee based on the recommendation of the candidate's Faculty.

Use of a third examiner

A third examiner is appointed to gain a majority recommendation within the examination panel when the recommendations of the first two examiners are divergent. The third examiner is not privy to the recommendations or reports of the original examiners, and is not advised of their role within the examination process. Upon receiving the third examiners recommendation and report, the Postgraduate Research Committee again considers how the examination will proceed.

Outcomes of the written examination stage

Please check your recommendation sheet for the specific recommendations available to you, however, generally the following examination outcomes are possible when a thesis is being examined for the first time (Please note that these recommendations do not apply to an MPhil thesis or a thesis which has already been defended at an oral examination).

Under first written examination, an examiner can recommend:

- a) That the thesis proceed to oral examination, no revisions required;
- b) That the thesis proceed to oral examination, revisions anticipated;
- c) That the thesis should not proceed to oral examination and should be returned to the candidate to revise and resubmit after a minimum re-enrolment period of 6 months*;
- d) That the thesis is not worthy of the award of a doctorate but should be considered for an MPhil or first masters degree; or
- e) That the thesis is not worthy of the award and no degree should be awarded.

*For a thesis under re-examination, option c is not available.

Outcomes of the oral examination stage

The following examination outcomes are possible when a thesis is being defended at an oral examination:

- a) That the thesis be accepted for the award, no revisions required;
hardbound thesis should be submitted within 2 weeks of the oral examination
- b) That the thesis be accepted for the award subject to the completion of minor revisions;
hardbound thesis should be submitted within 4 weeks of the oral examination
- c) That the thesis be accepted for the award subject to the completion of major amendments;
hardbound thesis should be submitted within 10 weeks of the oral examination
- d) That the thesis should not be accepted for the award and should be returned to the candidate to revise and resubmit after a minimum re-enrolment period of 6 months*;
- e) That the thesis should not be accepted for the award but should be considered for an MPhil or first masters degree;
- f) That the thesis should not be accepted for the award and no degree should be awarded.

*For a thesis under re-examination, option d is not available.

Amendments to the Thesis

The University of Waikato regulations allow for substantial amendments (requiring re-enrolment) to be made to the thesis either before or after the oral examination (but not both), as shown in the outcome options listed above.

Before oral examination: If the examiners consider a thesis is not of an acceptable standard to be awarded the degree at the written examination stage, a candidate may re-enrol for a minimum of 6 months to revise and resubmit their thesis. The candidate will be given access to the examiners reports during this revision period. At the end of the revision period the candidate will submit the revised thesis and a second written examination will take place. In the re-examination, the thesis must be of an acceptable standard to proceed to oral examination or the candidate may be awarded an MPhil.

After oral examination: At the written examination stage the examiners could consider a thesis may be of an acceptable standard to be awarded the degree and allow an oral examination to take place to discuss issues with the candidate. At the oral examination it may be found that substantial revisions to the thesis need to be made and the candidate can be asked to re-enrol for a minimum of 6 months to revise and resubmit the thesis. At the end of the revision period the candidate will submit the revised thesis and a second written examination will take place. In the re-examination, the thesis must be of an acceptable standard to be awarded the degree or the candidate may be awarded an MPhil. The regulations allow each candidate to complete only one re-examination (if necessary) and only one oral examination.

Re-examination of a Thesis

When a thesis is under re-examination it is preferred that the original examiners complete the re-examination. In cases where three examiners were used in the first examination, all three examiners will be invited to participate in the re-examination process. If the original examiners are not immediately available when the re-examination takes place, this may lead to a delay in the examination process. In exceptional circumstances, the Postgraduate Research Committee may allow the appointment of a new examiner(s) to replace those that are unable to participate at the time of the re-examination. In these cases the role of new examiners is not limited to checking the revisions indicated in original examination reports have been completed, but to examine the entire thesis.

Confidentiality

The University of Waikato nomination of examiners process allows for the candidate to be informed of who their examiners are, therefore confidentiality is not usually a possibility.

Examiner's Fee

A fee of NZ\$375 for a doctoral examination or \$225 for an MPhil examination (less tax in the case of New Zealand examiners) is paid to each examiner. The Faculty will also pay any examiners' expenses associated with attending the oral examination and will meet the cost of return air mail or courier postage of the thesis on request.

Contact Information

If you have any queries about the examining process or your role within it, please contact:

Te Mata Kairangi School of Graduate Research - SGR@waikato.ac.nz, or phone: 07 838 4466 Ext 4439

University of Waikato

Master of Philosophy (MPhil)

The regulations below set down the requirements for award of the MPhil degree.

Formal policies and procedures related to enrolment and examination for the MPhil, along with information about administrative matters, are available from the School of Graduate Research and on the University of Waikato website.

These regulations, policies and procedures are administered by the Dean of the School of Graduate Research and the University's Postgraduate Research Committee.

Regulations for the Degree of Master of Philosophy (MPhil)

1. The Degree is awarded to candidates who have successfully completed approved and supervised research, and presented the results lucidly in a thesis which
 - (a) critically investigates an approved topic of substance and significance, and
 - (b) demonstrates expertise in the methods of research and scholarship, and
 - (c) displays intellectual independence, and
 - (d) makes an original contribution to the research area.
2. To qualify to enrol for the MPhil, an applicant must
 - (a) have qualified for the award of a New Zealand bachelors degree with honours or masters degree¹, with at least second class honours (first division) or distinction, or for a qualification considered by the Academic Board to be equivalent, or
 - (b) have passed qualifying papers at a satisfactory level, and
 - (c) have demonstrated research experience, normally at least 30 points of research in an honours or masters degree, or significant professional research experience, or equivalent, or
 - (d) in exceptional circumstances have produced other evidence to the satisfaction of the Postgraduate Research Committee that he or she has adequate skills and knowledge to proceed with the proposed research.
3. Applicants whose first language is not English are required to meet the *English Language Requirements for Admission*. Students who have completed undergraduate and/or masters study in English will normally be considered to have met the English Language Requirements.
4. Applicants for the MPhil must apply through the online Application to Enrol.
5. Applications for admission to the MPhil and the conditions of enrolment are subject to approval by the Dean of the School of Graduate Research under delegated authority of the Academic Board.
6. As one of the preconditions for the approval of an application, the Dean of the School of Graduate Research will establish that the necessary supervision and resources can be provided for the chosen topic.
7. For each MPhil candidate, the Dean of the School of Graduate Research appoints a supervisory panel, each MPhil candidate must have a minimum of two supervisors, one of whom is a continuing staff member of the University and the chief supervisor.
8. Candidates are required to maintain contact with their supervisory panel throughout the entire period of their enrolment in the degree.
9. If at any time subsequent to the approval of an application the University encounters changes to its staffing or resources, it will make all reasonable efforts to ensure that these do not disadvantage the candidate. However, changes to staffing and resources can mean that a candidate's conditions of enrolment are subject to change or termination.
10. Applicants approved to enrol in the MPhil by the Dean of the School of Graduate Research must enrol in the relevant Faculty and, subject to progress which meets expectations, pursue their research for
 - (a) one year, if they are enrolled on a full-time basis, or
 - (b) two years, if they are enrolled on a part-time basis or
 - (c) a term approved by the Dean of the School of Graduate Research which represents a combination of full-time and part-time study.
11. A candidate may apply to the Dean of the School of Graduate Research for an extension of enrolment for a maximum period of twelve months full-time equivalent during their higher degree programme.
12. Candidates for the MPhil must not be concurrently enrolled in a research qualification at any other university without written permission from both universities.
13. Candidates are required to maintain continuous enrolment throughout the entire period of their degree.
14. Notwithstanding section 10 of these regulations, a candidate may apply to the Dean of the School of Graduate Research for a suspension from enrolment for a maximum period of twelve months full-time equivalent. A candidate is not entitled to supervision or any University resources during a period of suspension and does not incur tuition fees.
15. The Postgraduate Research Committee has authority to terminate the enrolment of a candidate at any time if the candidate fails to demonstrate progress which meets Faculty expectations and/or comply with any regulations or policies which relate to enrolment for the

Degree.

16. Following enrolment, candidates must submit six-monthly reports on the progress of their research work.
17. An MPhil thesis may consist of the candidate's published or unpublished material, or a combination. All such materials have been produced within the term of enrolment.
18. A candidate must indicate in the thesis any part that has been used or presented for any other degree.
19. Candidates must comply with the *Dissertations and Theses Regulations 2015* which set out the University's requirements with respect to the submission and presentation of theses.
20. The Dean of the School of Graduate Research appoints two examiners who are external to the University and not directly connected with the candidate or the candidate's research. At least one of the external examiners is based overseas. In the case of divergent examination outcomes, the Dean of the School of Graduate Research will appoint a third examiner.
21. The Dean of the School of Graduate Research makes a final decision on the award of the Degree. On the basis of the final reports of the examiners, the Dean of the School of Graduate Research may resolve
 - (a) that the thesis be accepted in its present form as fulfilling the requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy, or
 - (b) that the thesis be accepted as fulfilling the requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy subject to the candidate undertaking minor amendments and/or correcting typographical errors as required by the examiner, to the satisfaction of the chief supervisor, or
 - (c) that the thesis be accepted subject to the candidate completing substantial amendments to the satisfaction of the examiner or the chief supervisor, provided that these amendments are not so substantial as to necessitate re-submission and are completed within ten weeks, or
 - (d) that an oral examination of the candidate be conducted, and a further report, based on the oral examination, be provided by the examiners to the Dean of the School of Graduate Research, or
 - (e) that the thesis is not acceptable in its present form and will be returned to the candidate, who may revise it and re-submit it for examination after a re-enrolment for a minimum period of six months, or
 - (f) that the candidate has failed to meet the required standard and that no degree be awarded.
22. A candidate will be permitted to revise and re-submit a thesis only once and only one oral examination will be held.
23. Applicants or candidates for the MPhil who wish to appeal a decision by the Dean of the School of Graduate Research or the Postgraduate Research Committee, or who have a concern about supervision or any other aspect of their candidature, may raise the matter under the *Higher Degree Appeals and Complaints Regulations*.
24. The Dean of the School of Graduate Research and the Postgraduate Research Committee is required to report any decisions they make which fall outside of regulations to the Research Committee.

Note:

1. *Some professional masters degrees, such as the Master of Business Administration, are not intended to provide a pathway to doctoral study. Applications from students who have completed a professional masters degree will be considered on a case-by-case basis.*

— This page has been reformatted for printing.

Examiner's Recommendation MPhil

Attached is my report as examiner of the following doctoral thesis:

Candidate's name: Kelly Roe (9753890)

Thesis title: Disability and Equity in Medicine and Public Health

Chief Supervisor: Dr Justine Kingsbury

My recommendation:

- ☐ That the thesis be accepted in its present form as fulfilling the requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy
- ☐ That the thesis be accepted as fulfilling the requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy, subject to minor amendments and/or correcting typographical errors to the satisfaction of the Chief Supervisor, which are completed within 4 weeks.
- ☐ That the thesis be accepted subject to the candidate completing substantial amendments to the satisfaction of the examiner or chief supervisor**, provided that these amendments are not so substantial as to necessitate re-submission and are completed within 10 weeks.
- ☐ That an oral examination be conducted, and a further report, based on the oral examination, be provided by the examiner to the Postgraduate Studies Committee.
- ☐ That the thesis is not acceptable in its present form and will be returned to the candidate, who may revise it and re-submit it for examination after re-enrolment for a minimum period of six months.
- ☐ That the candidate has failed to meet the required standard and that no degree be awarded.

The amendments should be checked by:

- ☐ The Chief Supervisor
- ☐ The Examiner

I understand that the full contents of my report will be made available to the candidate

☐

Request for anonymity: (option available only to examiners who will not be taking part in an oral examination)

- ☐ I have provided a separate, anonymous version of my report for the candidate (refer to 'confidentiality' on the Information sheet provided to external examiners)

Signed:

Date:

 – External Examiner (OS)



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Doctoral Examination Information

Report of the **Overseas Examiner**

Feedback regarding MPhil thesis

Broadly speaking this is a thesis which shows some clear strengths but also some significant deficiencies that need to be addressed before this thesis will be acceptable.

In terms of strengths the strongest section focuses on the classification of the types and nature of categories that are under discussion within this thesis. This was clear, well written and I felt could potentially come earlier in the piece as a way of focusing and shaping the overall discussion. Clarity overall was good, with a clear writing style, although I did feel the transitions between different parts of the thesis could use more signposting for the reader so that it was easier to follow particularly why the transition was happening and the overall direction of travel of the thesis. Likewise the central insight that it can be useful to think about who the real beneficiaries of a policy are is I think a useful one.

In terms of weaknesses there were I think three significant deficiencies, and a few minor issues as well.

The first significant issue which I think would help the thesis throughout is that while the concept of discrimination is used repeatedly throughout the thesis there is no analysis of this concept within the thesis. I think such an analysis would helpfully inform several sections of this thesis and make some of its conclusions more defensible. For example discrimination is typically considered immoral if it tracks a non-relevant characteristic, however several times this thesis suggests that this kind of discrimination is morally problematic.

A second major issue has to do with an ongoing pattern of making significant empirical claims without providing references to underwrite these empirical claims. Some (non-exhaustive) examples of this include:

“More particularly, we are required to believe that the resources needed to attain health are finite and there will never be enough to meet demand for them.” Pg 22.

“It was in the name of tourist or student accommodation that we ended up with large slum boarding house / cheap motel style accommodation with, for example, no balcony space in high rise apartments, and a proliferation of accommodation that would be considered too small and lacking in basic amenities for full time habitation.” Pg 47.

“In response, we have seen already how inequality is increasing in New Zealand at a faster rate than it is in much of the world. This is because the New Zealand Government has failed to legislate to protect it's people comparably to the governments of other nations.” Pg 52.

“It is the knowledge that they are not being asked (or conned) into that that will result in informed consent being given. Otherwise: Nobody in their right mind would consent to that.” Pg 85.

“The service is not trying to be responsive to the people, it is trying to get the people to comply with the targets the Ministry of Health has set.” Pg 89.

“There is still concern that while representation of women is increasing (e.g., in Medical School) there is more expectation that they will defer to males - either by choosing to marry a doctor on graduation and / or by selecting a speciality in which there is less male competition.” Pg 101.

The final major issue has to do with the analysis and interpretation of some of those empirical claims, where rather than interpreting these charitably, instead the author seems to head to quite tendentious interpretations. While controversial interpretations can of course be correct, typically the evidential bar for such claims needs to be much higher, otherwise you risk arguing against a strawman rather than the actual position you are trying to criticise. It felt that a common pattern of reasoning offered was comparing two positions, and then concluding that since one is false, the other must be true, however there are often many less tendentious positions still available between the two. Some non-exhaustive examples of this are below:

"The argument against us bring our legislation more into line with the legislation of other developed nations has been a retort that we don't want to interfere with the free market. The market is not particularly free for the majority of New Zealanders, however. We are forced to buy the cheapest possible (end of the supply chain crap) because we cannot even afford to pay rent to live in our houses." Pg 47.

"In New Zealand we may wonder whether Maori and Pacific peoples have similarly been targeted for observational studies of untreated infections resulting from living in housing conditions known to be unhealthy. For how many generations are we going to sit by and watch the obvious unfold?" Pg 54.

A clear example of this style of reasoning was in the section on Maori rates of immunisation, which argued that these higher rates were an example of inequity. This was based on the notion that the primary beneficiaries of herd immunity are those who are immunocompromised. This seems a superficial analysis - while it is of course true that if you reach herd immunity levels then the primary benefactors are the immunocompromised, there are still direct benefits to individuals in terms of minimising illness of being vaccinated. And of course herd immunity levels are not reached in all cases. Furthermore given that Maori live in typically worse housing than many other New Zealanders (barring Pacific Islanders) they are particularly at risk in regards to diseases of mass infection. Simply because a very small group of people (some of whom include Maori) are greater potential beneficiaries if herd immunity is achieved doesn't mean that the vast number of Maori who now avoid measles isn't a larger benefit. In other words, even if Maori are not those who gain the most by higher rates of immunity, it might still be the best intervention available to benefit them as well. If that's the case then it is unclear why we should be worried that another (small group) benefits even further than they do.

"Statistics aren't being kept on how many people have made an informed consent decision about whether their child will be immunised or not, however." Pg 83.

It is unclear to me why in principle that the stat on vaccination rates doesn't straightforwardly track onto the stat on informed consent decisions regarding immunisation since it would be illegal for a clinician to administer a vaccine without informed consent. If the author wants to argue that these stats don't track together then they need to offer an argument for this.

"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." Pg 123.

"That there will be special clinics set up for Maori and poor people because capitation funding has put a bounty on their heads where clinics can earn more money off of providing less services to these people when nobody expects a better outcome for them." Pg 128.

“This view of trade where one should take more than ones fair share if one can get away with it is a game that results in a world that is worse off than what would be the case if both parties tried to come to a fair, and mutually beneficial deal.” Pg 131.

Economists will differ here - they will argue that the world you describe is actually very efficient since it closely resembles the real world - what you are missing is that trades where each is trying to get as much for themselves as possible can still be mutually beneficial trades. If they aren't then they will not be made.

In terms of minor issues there are a number of typos, broken sentences and grammatical issues throughout the thesis. Another minor issue was the extremely brief use of empirical evidence generated by the author themselves on page 20 – while they acknowledged some of the deficiencies of this evidence, given its weakness I felt it was better to simply exclude it, since it doesn't really add evidence to the argument here.

This is an interesting project, and I offer this feedback in the spirit of improving the overall piece once it is completed.