

**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*

3 July 2019

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](mailto: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 degree<sup>1</sup>, 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 Master of Philosophy 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 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)





# **Report of the** **Overseas Examiner**

## Examiner's Recommendation MPhil

Attached is my report as examiner of the following Master of Philosophy 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 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:**

17/9/12

 – External Examiner (OS)

## Mphil – Resubmission examination report

This is a thesis on an interesting topic which has a number of strengths, and weaknesses. As such I am recommending an oral examination to probe the specific weak points identified. I should note, this thesis has been greatly improved by the additional time taken, with an increased use of evidence, more clear signposting and structure all pointing to development.

In terms of strengths, I still think the central insight of the piece is a helpful contribution to what the author acknowledges that it is a messy and difficult topic to engage with given the space of time and words available to wrestle with it – on that note, I did think given this recognition that the author did a good job of defining their scope and bracketing off some side issues. And I agree with them, that a topic area is tough and hard to grapple with should not be a reason to avoid addressing it, indeed it might be a reason to think it is even more pressing to address. Clarity is in general good and the structural changes have improved further upon this.

In my previous report I identified three significant deficiencies, have these been addressed in the revised document?

The first was that there didn't seem to be an analysis of the concept of discrimination within the thesis – which given how central the notion was to the thesis was a substantial issue.

This issue has been partially addressed – there is now an analysis of the concept of discrimination present. However at several key points it seems that either that analysis has been forgotten, or more needs to be done to show that the discrimination being discussed is discrimination of the morally problematic sort. So for example, on page 100 insurance companies charging higher premiums to people due to their membership of 'equity groups' is decried as discrimination, which it clearly is – but more work needs to be done to show it is morally problematic discrimination, rather than simply a reflection of a higher likely cost to the company – in other words, it needs to be shown that this is discrimination on the basis of an irrelevant characteristic. Similarly I was confused how this showed that higher capitation funding was problematic – since again it is on the basis of providing for higher need – which would seem to be a relevant characteristic. This is dealt with better in the context of vaccination on page 122, where an argument is given for why we should view the immunocompromised as the primary beneficiaries of vaccination (though further work would have helped considerably on both why this is important, and why a sufficient amount of secondary benefits can't outweigh this). The same issues with the implementation of the concept of discrimination within the argument come up on page 160 regarding medical school admissions requesting disability information from applicants – the author is utterly right that this is discrimination – but they then do none of the further work to show that it is morally problematic discrimination, rather than simply selecting candidates on the basis of relevant information about likely fitness to practice. As such I do not feel that this issue has been appropriately addressed.

The second issue was the pattern of making significant empirical claims without referencing these claims. I'm happy to say I consider this largely addressed, both from the position of the author

weakening many of these claims, and from the inclusion of further empirical resources and underpinnings to strengthen the claims they do make.

The final issue was in making quite tendentious interpretations of those empirical claims, without being charitable. This issue is still present to some degree – and indeed some of the quotes I gave as examples of this remain intact in the thesis. Nonetheless this has had some work to address this. Most clearly this has been done in regards to the claims regarding Maori rates of immunisation where argument has been made to further reinforce the line of reasoning being followed. While I think further work on this would further improve the thesis I do believe this deficiency to be largely redressed.

There are still some minor issues outstanding, while signposting was improved and many minor errors have been corrected, sign posting could have been further improved within sections – partially due to the sheer scope being covered here some of the transitions between sections are quite jarring, with the reader left to their own devices to determine what was established in the previous section, and why a new section has begun.

So in sum, the second and third issues I identified have been largely addressed. However the first issue remains partially unaddressed and the implications of that flow through the thesis, leading to some fairly tendentious claims around particular activities being discriminatory in the normatively thick sense, without having done enough leg work to properly underwrite those claims. As such I find myself unable to recommend at this stage that this thesis fulfils the requirements for an Mphil.