



“artsVISOR”

Newsletter, Issue 9, March 2005

Contents Page

[1] Overdue & Forthcoming Faculty Colloquia to December 2005.....1-2
 [2] Invitation: Non Conventional” Conventional Doctoral Experience.....2
 [3] Induction Sessions – New & Recent Postgraduates.....2-3
 [4] Advising Coursework Postgraduates Re:- Eligibility for Research Programmes.....3
 [5] Changed Procedures for Ethics Clearance- Application by Honours Masters Candidates.....3-4
 [6] Research Services’ 2005 Timetable for International & Domestic Scholarship Rounds4
 [7] Developing Extended Research Proposals...4-7
 [8] Nominating Potential Examiners.....7-8

News from the Faculty HDR Coordinator

Welcome to our ninth issue of “artsVISOR” where, on approximately a quarterly basis, we continue to highlight issues relevant to those of us currently or potentially acting as postgraduate supervisors.

Should you wish to respond to any of the items featured in this or previous issues, please feel free to email us so that your comments can open discussion and debate amongst us all.

If you are aware of any new members of staff in your discipline, area, or centre, it would be much appreciated if you would advise them of this and past issues as well as advising Annette Davis (in the absence of Liz Hewitt) [email: eah@deakin.edu.au] of their names and contact details for future issues. As always, may we invite you to copy relevant excerpts for postgraduates in your charge.

RG::04.04.2005

[1] Overdue Forthcoming Faculty Colloquia to December 2005

Amongst our postgraduates (enrolled since August 2001) formally required to undertake a Faculty Colloquium are the following forty-five whose estimated due dates occur before December 2005; red indicating those overdue.

At the time of compiling this list (in School and date order with alternative bookings), there were still times from June 2005 available for booking, arrangements for which should be negotiated at least three months in advance by principal supervisors with Annette Davis (in the absence of Liz Hewitt) [email: eah@deakin.edu.au].

Masters candidates have the option of undertaking their confirmation colloquia nine months (or its part-time equivalent) into their candidature.

S.S.I.S.** [30]: ** See Note below

- Johnson, Mark (PhD): January 2003 (van Hooft)
- Abbott, Jacqueline (PhD): October 2003 (Walker) → intermitted
- Barker, Sharon (MA): October 2003 (Kenny)
- Langdale, Faye (MA): December 2003 (Walker) → intermitted
- Hingston, Jarrod (MA): February 2004 (Mansouri)
- Watters, Gregory (PhD): February 2004 (Walker)
- Brewer, Douglas (PhD): March 2004 (Remenyi)
- Whitting, Christopher (PhD): March 2004 (Mansouri)
- Olczak, Margaret (PhD): August 2004 (van Hooft) -→ June 2005
- Lewis, Peter (PhD): October 2004 (Butcher) -→ intermitted
- Angelette, William (PhD): November 2004 (Jacobs) → May 2005
- Schmidt, Maria (PhD): November 2004 (Remenyi)
- Ford, Gentle (PhD): December 2004 (Stokes) -→ May 2005
- Humphries, Mark (PhD): January 2005 (Burgess) → March 2005
- Joel, Tony (PhD): January 2005 (Beaumont) → June 2005 [t.b.c.]

Menzel, Kelly (PhD): January 2005 (Hancock) →
intermitted
Woodlock, Delanie (PhD): January 2005 (Lane)
Young, Kelly (PhD): January 2005 (Jacobs) →
intermitted
Abdallah, Ehssan (PhD): February 2005 (Mansouri) →
intermitted
Carter, Paul (PhD): February 2005 (Alomes)
Myers, Phillip (PhD): February 2005 (Remenyi)
Bjork-Billings, Pam (MA): March 2005 (Lane)
Ernst, Ralf (PhD): March 2005 (Remenyi)
Ton-That, Quynh-Du (PhD): April 2005 (Long)
Shea, Peter (PhD): May 2005 (Jacobs)
Shaw, Dawn (PhD): August 2005 (Grigg)
Wheelan, Chad (PhD): August 2005 (Jacobs)
Zinberg, Yakov (PhD): August 2005 (Snyder)
Huang, Hui Chi (PhD): September 2005 (Logan)

S.C.C.A. [15]:

Dobbyn, Timothy (PhD): August 2003 (Edwards) →
April 2005
Cormick, Craig (PhD): June 2004 (Meehan)
Watkins, Alix (PhD): August 2004 (Ommundsen) →
May 2005
Johnston, Peter (PhD): November 2004 (Meehan) →
July 2005
Ryan, Tony (PhD): November 2004 (Tebble) → April
2005
Yuk, "Helena" (PhD): February 2005 (Vincs) → March
& June 2005
Ling, David (MA): March 2005 (McCulloch) → May
2005
Caldwell, David (MA): March 2005 (Tebble) → April
2005
Lang, Lisa (MA): March 2005 (Meehan)
Angwin, Sarah (PhD): April 2005 (McCulloch)
Taylor, Maxwell (MA): April 2005 (Mishra)
Crocker, Sally (PhD): August 2005 (Mishra)
Evison-Griffith, Traicee (PhD): September 2005
(McCulloch)
Bartlett, Adam (PhD): October 2005 (Clemens)
Cho, Tom (PhD): December 2005 (Goodrich) → April
2005

Note:

The recently approved administrative division of the School of Social & International Studies under
* Acting Head of School of History, Heritage & Society: Associate Professor David Lowe
* Acting Head of School of International & Political Studies: Associate Professor Stan van Hooft
has not been taken into account in this list and therefore does not sort candidates into the S.H.H.S. areas of Australian Studies, History, Cultural Heritage & Museum Studies, Sociology, Criminology, Anthropology, and Gender Studies nor the S.I.P.S. areas of Politics & Policy Studies, International Relations, International & Community Development, Languages [Arabic, Mandarin Chinese, Bahasa Indonesian], and Philosophy.

[2] Invitation to Participate in "Non-Conventional" Conventional Doctoral Experience

"For my Doctoral research at the University of Technology - Sydney, I am exploring the experiences of doctoral students from traditional (not "fine arts") disciplines who create theses with additional components such as video, poetry, music and pre-published papers as Deakin University permits.

I shall visit Deakin in June for one hour informal conversations with a few doctoral students and one hour interviews with a couple of supervisors and examiners who have experienced such non-traditional research. For more information about my research, please see: <http://www.lib.mq.edu.au/bsomerset/index.html>.

If you are willing to participate in the research, please email me at: Bronte.J.Somerset@student.uts.edu.au.

With kind regards Bronte

Ms Bronte J. Somerset, M.Ed.
Ed.D. Candidate [Student No. 00095808]
Faculty of Education, University of Technology Sydney
Ethics Approval No.: UTS HREC2004-017
Tel.: [02] 8800 5772 [H]

[3] Induction Sessions – New & Recent Postgraduates

Research Services will be conducting induction sessions for new and recent postgraduates between the 19th and the 29th April. Apart from reminding new and recent students in our charge, supervisory staff are more than welcome at these sessions, even if it is for the purposes of "re-freshing" memories of the processes involved in postgraduate candidacy at Deakin. A copy of the pro forma invitation follows:

Dear -----

I am pleased to invite you to attend an information session for new higher degree by research candidates. This letter has been sent to all candidates who have commenced since the last session was held in semester 2 of 2004.

The session will cover a range of topics of interest to you, such as:

- managing your candidature
- establishing an effective relationship with your supervisor
- the rights and responsibilities of students and supervisors
- scholarship matters
- examinations (how the process works, outcomes).

Sessions will be held in Melbourne, Geelong and Warrnambool. You are invited to attend the one most convenient to you.

Melbourne - Tuesday, 19 April at 1:30pm in room H2.125 (Building H2, Burwood)

Warrnambool - Tuesday, 26 April at 1:30pm in room J2.20 (Building J)

Geelong - Friday, 29 April at 10:30am in room GD06 (Level D, Business and Law Building)

Campus maps are available at:
<http://www.deakin.edu.au/campuses/>

Light refreshments will be served. To facilitate catering arrangements, could you please let Jill Dalton know if you will be attending and at which venue (telephone: 03 5227 2006 or email at: <jill.dalton@deakin.edu.au>. It would be appreciated if you could let Jill know at least three days before the session you will be attending.

Yours [etc.]

[4] Advising Coursework Postgraduates about Eligibility for Research Programmes

Some students undertaking postgraduate coursework programmes may be under the impression that their "minor" theses or projects, which are weighted up to 25.0% or four credit points of the course, automatically qualify them for post-graduate research programmes. This may, in part, arise from the fact that there are two points in Regulation 5.2 (11) that may lead to different interpretations of what is involved in meeting the entry requirements of postgraduate research programmes; the two points being:

2.11 Definition: 'Thesis' - materials and activities as are presented for examination by a candidate.

5.1.2 ...honours or a degree of master with a substantial research component from a recognised tertiary institution...

Yet, at the same time, most of us have been working on the basis that the standard entry into postgraduate research programmes is the B.A. (Hons.) or equivalent at specified levels of honours where the research component is normally weighted up to 66.7%.

In an effort to clarify some of the issues in this state of affairs, what follows are excerpts from an email exchange with Grant Michie of Research Services in mid-February 2005:

Question: *Has the University officially quantified "substantial research component"?*

Response:

No, we haven't officially quantified "substantial research component." Each case is looked at on its merits and the standard against which the [doctoral] applicant is measured in all cases is Honours 2A equivalence. To

insist on a 2/3 research component in all cases could be a bit inflexible. There are cases in which the applicants' entry course doesn't conform to the 2/3 rule but where they have clearly demonstrated their capacity to do original research.

[We cannot] infer that [coursework postgraduates] have an automatic right of entry into an HDR course if they complete the four credit point [or "minor" 20,000 word] thesis. There are only two courses which the [University] HDR Committee has approved as alternative pathways into doctoral candidature:

1. The Deakin MEd. The Faculty of Education does not have an honours stream so there's really no other way in for their graduates. Certain standards are prescribed in terms of the number of credit points of the research unit and the grades to be achieved.

2. Graduate Diplomas in Psychology which conform to the normal honours structure and which are accredited by the Australian Psychological Association. For some reason, the Grad.Dip. seems fairly popular in psychology and...about 50% of the D.Psych. applicants enter with this qualification. A Distinction grade is required.

Question: *Although the 20,000 word minor thesis may be considered comparable in word length to the Honours thesis, is the coursework masters minor thesis excluded because it is not independently 'examined'?*

Response: I don't think the specifics about assessment have ever been a factor. I know that some honours theses are examined by at least one external person (I'm not sure if there is a University policy on this), but the MEd thesis units are examined internally. And who knows what happens in every other institution regarding honours and graduate diplomas? We treat them all as equivalent under the unified national system.

In summary, as such coursework applicants are only considered on a case-by-case basis, they would be well advised to consult the Faculty's Research Office and University's Research Services **before** making any formal application.

[5] Changed Procedures for Ethics Clearance Applications by Honours & Masters Candidates

In late February 2005, [Dr] Karen Lane, Chair of the Arts Faculty Ethics Committee, pointed out two issues concerning ethics clearance applications:

1. Since the Arts Faculty Ethics Committee received very few applications in 2004, it has been decided to transfer the Secretariat of the Ethics Committee to DUHREC. This means that **all Masters and Honours ethics applications** will now be directed to [Dr] Victoria Emery, Secretary, DUHREC. The forms and meeting dates for 2005 can be found at <http://www.research.deakin.edu.au/ethics/human/ind ex.htm>

2. The other issue to stress to research students is the necessity to apply to the Ethics Committee before any research involving human subjects may take place. The DUHREC had been concerned last year that the reduced number of applications from Arts may be due to researchers not applying for ethics clearance.

It is also worth noting that DUHREC meets each month and that the closing date for receipt of applications is usually just over two weeks before the meeting date. This allows the application to be photocopied and distributed to around eight people who sit on the panels who need time to consider the applications before the panel meets. There is also some lapse of time before the student or researcher will hear back from the committee. This may take around one to two weeks. The point to be made is that ethics clearance may involve around four weeks from submission to notification of outcome. In my experience, there are usually some modifications to be made to the original application after which the proposal will need to be resubmitted for executive approval. This stretches the time of endorsement even further and may delay the commencement of the research study.

Researchers should be made aware of this time span so that they may build it into their research plans and prepare their ethics application sooner rather than later and avoid frustrating delays in the empirical stage.

Victoria Emery has posted the meeting dates in 2005 for DUHREC as follows:

	Applications Close	Meeting
Meeting 1-05	closed	21 February
Meeting 2-05	closed	4 April
Meeting 3-05	11 April	16 May
Meeting 4-05	23 May	27 June
Meeting 5-05	4 July	8 August
Meeting 6-05	15 August	21 September
Meeting 7-05	26 September	31 October
Meeting 8-05	7 November	14 December

She has also advised that applications should be sent to her at Research Services, Burwood and that they need to be emailed to her at research-ethics@deakin.edu.au as well as submitted in signed hard copy.

[6] Research Services' 2005 Timetable for International and Domestic Scholarship Rounds

*** Timetable for the 2005 APA/DUPR Mid-Year Scholarship Round:**

Applications close	30 June 2005
Applications to Schools	11 July 2005
Ranked School lists to Research Services	25 July 2005
Scholarships Sub-Committee meets	3 August 2005
Offers made	4 August 2005
Final date for lodgement of acceptances	19 August 2005

*** Timetable for International Scholarships:**

Applications close	30 September 2005
Applications to Faculties	24 October 2005
Ranked Faculty lists to Research Services	7 November 2005
Scholarships Sub-committee meets	11 November 2005
Offers made	17 November 2005

*** Timetable for APA/DUPR Scholarships:**

Applications close	31 October 2005
Applications to Schools	14 November 2005
Ranked School lists to Research Services	25 November 2005
Scholarships Sub-Committee meets	7 December 2005
Offers made	8 December 2005
Final date for lodgement of acceptances	22 December 2005

Please advise any prospective applicants known to you of the above mid-year and end-of-year rounds. Given the intensely competitive nature of government scholarships, it is worth noting that, in practice, applicants need first-class honours in their B.A.(Hons.)—or its equivalent explicitly documented—to have any chance of securing such scholarships.

[7] Developing Extended Research Proposals

Transcribed below is a sample masters thesis proposal of approximately 715 words (plus bibliography) followed by a ten-point analysis of what usually needs to be involved in extending such a proposal up to 15,000 words. One of the reasons for including such material for our consideration is in response to enquiries about the demands implied by confirmation colloquia within the first nine to twelve months of the masters candidacy where, in conventional circumstances,

documentation should include:

- * a brief statement of the **research project/problem/question**;
- * the **rationale** for the proposed research and its **significance**;
- * a discussion of **relevant theoretical perspectives**;
- * and the disciplinary or intellectual **context** in which the research will be conducted.

where students should demonstrate that:

- * they are familiar with the **relevant literature**;
- * they are able to discuss their proposed **methodology** and its appropriateness for the particular research topic;
- * they can clearly describe their work **schedule** to date and indicate their future work schedule up to the submission of the thesis on a chapter-by-chapter or phase-by-phase basis.

The above document should be accompanied by a **bibliography** and should indicate whether the proposed research will require **ethics clearance**.

(Much the same, it should be added, applies to doctoral candidates.)

[i] Sample M.A. Thesis Proposal

Submitted by: Jane Doe, January 31, 1995

Supervisor: Faculty Member

Title: Metaphor and Narrative in Economics: The Cognitive Function and Epistemic Consequences of Rhetoric in Economic Theory

Overview:

The notion that metaphor plays an important cognitive role in structuring our understanding of the world poses interesting and important questions both for philosophers of language and philosophers of science. In the former field, questions about how metaphors work and what they mean have been taken up and re-examined by philosophers such as Max Black, John Searle, and Donald Davidson. Philosophers and historians of science have in the meantime recognized the relevance of such debates to their own analyses of model-building and theory choice. In particular, the notion that scientific explanation hinges largely on metaphoric redescription has attracted a great deal of attention. Mary Hesse, Richard Boyd, Thomas Kuhn and others have argued that metaphors play not just an exegetical or heuristic role in science, but are instead *constitutive* of the theories they express.

How might such views come to bear on economic theory? Economics as a discipline has moved far beyond basic animating metaphors such as Adam Smith's infamous 'invisible hand'. Indeed, most practicing economists place much less importance on the verbal exposition of their models than on the mathematics itself, and the notion that the 'rhetoric' of economics might be worth serious study has had little impact on the core of the discipline. Nonetheless, a small number of economists and philosophers of economics (including

Donald McCloskey, Arjo Klamer, and Philip Mirowski) have begun to make space for the discussion of such issues, and have drawn some attention to their significance for the practice and self-understanding of the discipline.

McCloskey, for example, has argued that economists share with other scientists a reliance on the creation of metaphors and narratives, and that the explanatory power of their theories lies first and foremost in the rhetoric used to make economic phenomena intelligible — McCloskey's view of economic discourse has been highly influenced by a post-modernism of a Rortian flavour and shares some of its major epistemological (or post-epistemological) conclusions.

Objectives:

In my thesis, I intend to explore the cognitive function of metaphor and narrative in economic theory, and to assess the anti-realist or post-epistemological stance that economists following Donald McCloskey's lead have adopted. My first task will be to argue that both metaphor and narrative make important contributions to the explanatory power of economic theories, and that metaphor in particular plays a crucial role in the development of economic models. To this end I will discuss an interactionist or structure-mapping theory of metaphor, and will examine two powerful economic metaphors (the Walrasian 'market' with its 'auctioneer', and the picture of certain economic interactions as strategic 'games').

My second objective will be to clarify some epistemological implications of the above insights. If much of what economists take to be literal language or purely mathematical analysis is actually structured by pervasive constitutive metaphors, what are we to make of the project of justifying knowledge claims in economics? Does it make any sense to speak of an economic reality that theories can approach with varying degrees of accuracy?

I will argue that we ought to look before we leap to McCloskey's self-proclaimed post-modern conclusions. Perhaps ironically, his critical stance can be argued to have largely conservative implications for the actual practice of economics. As Alexander Rosenberg points out, McCloskey arrives at a very *laissez-faire* approach to business as usual in the discipline. I will defend the claim that explicit evaluation of economic metaphors is both possible and desirable. Insofar as we have the resources to locate both strengths and flaws in certain models and

forms of discourse, we ought not to be reticent to question the nature of business as usual in economics. For example, in his *More Heat than Light* Philip Mirowski provides an extended analysis of what he takes to be an inadequate constitutive metaphor, arguing that modern neoclassical economics borrows extensively from the language of 19th century energy physics, but is ultimately incoherent because the essential part of the analogy (the principle of conservation) fails. To give another example, recent feminist work has been directed

at uncovering inconsistency and androcentrism within constitutive economic metaphors. What it takes to uncover incoherent metaphors and crucial disanalogies is of course a complex question, and the aim of this thesis will not be to provide an answer, but rather to point to its importance, value and seriousness as a question.

Bibliography

- Black, Max. 1981 (1955). "Metaphor." In Mark Johnson (ed.). *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.: 63-82.
- Boyd, Richard N. 1979. "Metaphor and Theory Change: What is 'Metaphor' a Metaphor For?" In Andrew Ortony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 356-408.
- Friedman, Milton. 1994. "The Methodology of Positive Economics." In Michael Martin and Lee C. MacIntyre (ed.) *Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Hausman, Daniel. 1992. *Essays on Philosophy and Economic Methodology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1992. *The Inexact and Separate Science of Economics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Henderson, Willie, et al. (eds.). 1993. *Economics and Language*. London: Routledge.
- Hesse, Mary. 1966. *Models and Analogies in Science*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Ingrao, Bruna and Giorgio Israel. 1990. *The Invisible Hand — Economic Equilibrium in the History of Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klamer, Arjo, Donald McCloskey, and Robert Solow (eds.) 1988. *The Consequences of Economic Rhetoric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuhn, Thomas. 1979. "Metaphor in Science," In Andrew Ortony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1981. "Conceptual Metaphor in Everyday Language," In Mark Johnson (ed.) *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- McCloskey, Donald. 1994. *Knowledge and Persuasion in Economics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1985. *The Rhetoric of Economics*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- . 1991. "Storytelling in Economics." In Don Lavoie (ed.) *Economics and Hermeneutics*. London: Routledge.
- Mirowski, Philip. 1994. *More Heat than Light*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (ed.). 1989. *Natural Images in Economic Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ortony, Antony (ed.). 1979. *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rorty, Richard. 1982. *The Consequences of Pragmatism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 1979. *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenberg, Alexander. 1992. *Economics — Mathematical Politics or Science of Diminishing Returns?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[Source: **2004/2005 Graduate Handbook**,
Department of Philosophy,
Queens University – Kingston, Canada]
<http://www.queensu.ca/philosophy/>

[ii] Guidelines for Extended Research Proposals

The extended research proposal...will include at least the following ten elements, each of which may be suitably refined and/or subdivided to suit individual projects:

1. **Overview.** A concise summary of the research proposal, indicating briefly how this fits in with the philosophy and research orientation of the [School's] programme...
2. **Research Problem.** A clear statement of the research problem, appealing to suitable evidence which supports the claim that such a problem actually exists. Given that the research problem is properly substantiated and formulated, the candidate should also explain in detail why this is an important and/or interesting topic worth addressing. Of course, an outline of the relevant background context may be necessary for a full appreciation of its importance. The candidate must use his or her judgement in deciding how much of this material is necessary to include.
3. **Literature Review.** A literature review, involving the presentation of a critical survey of how dominant approaches have tackled (or could tackle) the research problem identified (eg., depending on the nature of the problem identified these approaches may be empirical, normative, or critical-philosophical), highlighting both their strengths and weaknesses.
4. **Basic Hypothesis.** A statement of the candidate's basic hypothesis in the form of an intuitive, though clear, formulation of an alternative and/or supplementary explanation, understanding, or justification. (Points 2 to 4 should be cast in language that can be clearly understood by anyone familiar with the literature addressing the research problem identified. It should be possible thus far to avoid any reference to taxing theoretical jargon.)
5. **Approach and Formal Hypothesis.** A clear statement of the approach the candidate wishes to adopt in an attempt to demonstrate the plausibility of the basic hypothesis, justifying this choice in detail. How do the theoretical concepts derived from this approach clarify and make more precise the intuition contained in the hypothesis? How can one translate it into more precise theoretical terms, yielding a formal hypothesis? How can such a theoretical framework be seen to respond to the problems encountered in other approaches to the research problem?
6. **Research Objectives.** An account of how the formal hypothesis can be broken down into a series of manageable objectives which will correspond, more or less, to the chapters of the thesis as a whole. Under each

chapter heading, the candidate should describe how it fits into the overall structure of the argument that seeks to establish the validity of the hypothesis.

7. **Corpus.** A clear description of the corpus (whether empirical evidence, sources of justification, and/or philosophical tracts) one intends to appeal to in order to support the hypothesis, along with a detailed justification of this choice.

8. **Methodology.** An elaboration and justification of the proposed methods and techniques of evidence gathering and analysis. This involves linking such methods to the theoretical approach chosen and the kind of evidence the candidate will rely upon.

9. **Research Programme.** A concluding statement, outlining the kinds of research questions this line of inquiry opens up, both empirical and theoretical. What kind of research project will this...thesis make possible? Why is this important and/or interesting?

10. **Chapter Timetable.** A summary chapter breakdown of the thesis, with estimated dates of completion.

[Source: Aletta Norval et al., **Ideology and Discourse Analysis Graduate Handbook**, Department of Government, University of Essex, 2004]

[8] Nominating Potential Examiners

One of the more contentious areas of supervision is the task of nominating potential examiners. The perceived difficulty is not so much that of, for example, the strict maintenance of confidentiality as of the selection of those with appropriate experience and expertise.

As many of us would be aware, Research Services is undertaking the experiment in 2005 of trialling the use of three examiners for all Arts submissions in an effort to speed the examination process. (Current practice has been to use two examiners, only using a third in cases either where there is a disagreement or in the case of performances or exhibitions.)

In view of debate over the nomination of potential examiners, it seems worthwhile considering the following excerpts from Research Services' "**Appointment of Thesis Examiners**" current guidelines should supervisors wish to pursue discussions in specific cases.

Section Two: From the Procedures:

The [University's H.D.R.] Committee shall appoint examiners of the thesis who are external to the University on the basis of their internationally recognised expertise in the field of study. The Head of School shall provide at least four nominations for examiners, of which normally at least

one should be from outside the Australasian region. The Head shall consult appropriate members of the supervisory team and other staff before making the nominations, which must be made on the prescribed form.

The Committee shall consider any statement [from the candidate giving reasons why any specified person ought not to be appointed as an examiner] prior to the selection of examiners.

The thesis shall be examined by two or three examiners as determined by the Committee.

A thesis which has been revised and presented for re-examination shall wherever practicable be examined by the examiners who did not accept the original version. Where an examiner is unable or unwilling to act again the Committee shall appoint a new examiner.

Section Three: Additional Factors:

Qualifications and experience of examiners

The Regulation requires that an examiner is an expert in the field. It is also important that the examiner understands the process of examining, and is familiar with the degree being sought and the standard of performance expected.

Experience indicates that the following conditions are advisable:

- The examiner should be reasonably senior, and certainly not an early career researcher.
- The examiner should hold the degree being sought or an equivalent award.
- The examiner should have strong, active and current links with the international academic community through being an academic staff member or a member of an organisation closely connected to a university.
- The examiner should have experience in assessing theses at this level.

Experience shows that the following frequently prove unsatisfactory as examiners:

- nominees who are early in their careers, recent graduates at the level under examination or do not hold an equivalent qualification;
- nominees who are not actively linked to the academy and in touch with academic standards, even though they may be acknowledged experts in the field and belong to prestigious research organisations or hold senior professional positions;
- nominees with little experience of examining higher degree theses;
- nominees who are retired and are no longer professionally active.

Victorian examiners

Examiners must be 'disinterested' and independent from the candidature. It is not only independence that is important but also the perception of independence, and

therefore as far as possible no more than one examiner from Victoria is used in an examination.

Number of nominees sought

More than ten percent of Deakin HDR candidates have the first version of their thesis rejected by the majority of examiners, and are invited to revise the thesis for re-submission. As far as possible the revised thesis is examined by the examiners who rejected the original version, but in a significant number of cases an examiner is unable or unwilling to act again and a replacement must be found. It is highly desirable that replacements can be appointed without having to seek additional nominations from the School, who will have seen the original examiners' reports and could be charged with using this information to guide further nominations. The practice is therefore to seek more nominations at the start than will be needed for the initial examination.
