in arts faculties females account for 19.2 per cent of the academic staff in science faculties, however, only 7.5 per cent of the academic staff is female. But the fact that in arts faculties only 32.5 per cent of the academic staff obtained their second degrees in Australia in contrast with 48.8 per cent in science further illustrates the problems facing females. Table 4 has shown that proportionately more females than males obtain their second degrees in Australia. It seems possible therefore that females are further disadvantaged in that they are trying to obtain positions with Australian degrees in the faculties which show a lower preference for local qualifications.

Summary
Women are clearly disadvantaged but some of the reasons may be those not usually seen as discriminatory. They appear to be restricted by the operation of three factors in addition to those usual­ly held to operate against women. A high proportion have Australian degrees, they may also have limited access to publication opportunities in overseas journals and are more frequently found in arts-type disciplines which appear to place greater emphasis on the first two factors than do science disciplines. Males trained in Australia may also be disadvantaged in comparison with those in the United Kingdom, and in more recent years, in North America. The survey has also shown that the so-called search for excellence does not result in the same appointment patterns in each university. There are distinct locational influences operating in different cities upon the selection of staff. Faculty procedures also differ and the age of the university may also be disadvantageous in comparison with those in the overseas journals and are more frequently found in disciplines. Males trained in Australia may also be
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EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

Higher Degree Examination Procedures in Australian Universities

Preamble
Some time after the award of my Ph.D. in April 1977 I made a submission to a number of Australian universities concerning Proposed Altera­tions to University By-laws Governing Higher Degrees. This submission dealt with various aspects of supervising and examining procedures. Its content was partly inspired by my own ex­periences as a Ph.D. candidate, although the issues raised in it were of a much more general nature. It is hoped that the suggested changes went well beyond the scope of my personal preoccupations. The document concentrated on the following main issues:

(a) plan with the candidate an appropriate course of study;
(b) meet the candidate at regular intervals to discuss and guide the progress of the work;
(c) advise the candidate on the aims, scope and presentation of the thesis and on publication likely to arise from the work;
(d) insist on seeing drafts of the major sections of the thesis as they are prepared;
(e) comment critically on the draft of the com­pleted thesis before it is submitted by the candidate;
(f) ensure that, having regard to the nature of the topic, any thesis presented is not un­necessarily long.

Change of Supervisor
A candidate may apply through the head of his or her Department to the Post-graduate Studies Com­mittee at any time for a change in supervisor. However, it should be appreciated that unless another qualified person is willing to act as supervisor the candidate may lapse.

The supervisor(s) shall be required to provide a report on the thesis at the time of the submission to the examiners. The report will contain a history of the candidature, the problems and difficulties the candidate has encountered and in particular it will state which parts or aspects of the work represent the supervisory own contribution in the form of advice or instructions to the candidate.

In general, the report shall clearly state the extent to which the supervisor(s) accepted responsibility for, or approved of, the submitted work.

Copies of the supervisor(s)’ report shall be made available to the Professional Board, the examiner(s) and the candidate. The candidate may object to the supervi­sor(s)’ and the examiner(s) disagreement with the report, if any.

Examiner
The Professional Board shall appoint three ex-
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amined by the examiner(s). In the event of conflicting reports and after discussion, the examiners are unable to resolve their differences, or in any case where the examiners have been unable to consult or have the examiner(s) present, the Professorial Board shall appoint an ad hoc committee of two postgraduate committee(s) to report and recommend to the Professorial Board. 

Discussion Forum 
The candidate may request an open discussion arrangement in cases (i) and (ii) after re-submission to discuss the main points arising from the various reports. The candidate’s reports should be duplicated, and the forum advertised, giving opportunity for any qualified person to attend and/or contribute to the discussion. 

In the case when the recommendation of the examiners is unanimous according to (b) above), a Professorial Board recommendation is required for the open forum discussion.

The final acceptance or rejection of the thesis for the degree after the discussion will be decided by the Professorial Board or by a five member committee appointed by the Professorial Board by a majority vote (secret ballot).

I further enclosed with my submission, an outline of the Hungarian Scientific Association’s examination procedures, description of which was sent to me by a member of that Institute (Appendix I). The democratic method given in it greatly surprised me and I find their system far superior to our own. I received replies from all the universities concerned. Some simply acknowledged my letter, others expressed their intentions to communicate. Few universities informed me that they had committees investigating the problems associated with the examining of postgraduate degrees. They also undertook to refer my proposals to these committees and to keep me informed of the results of their deliberations. In one case I was invited to meet the chairman of the relevant committee, who was a senior professor in his university, to present my case personally. He promised to send me minutes of his committee’s discussions on the problems I was concerned with, which I took to be a rather unusual undertaking as the proceedings of these committees are not normally made public. 

Consultation of the examiners is always known to the candidate. They cannot hide behind the veil of anonymity. The chances of their handing down irresponsible verdicts are reduced. In some cases the candidate had the right to veto the appointment of an examiner if she felt that the examiner would be biased. Such bias may be due to methodological or political differences, to the candidate’s critical comments in the thesis on the examiner’s publications, and to the fact that the candidate had published an unfavourable review of a book written by the examiner, the latter being unknown to the candidate in my own experience), and occasionally other personal tensions, jealousies or antipathy of which the Head of Department and the university cannot be expected to be aware.

(2) In the North American system the candidate, the supervisor(s) and the examiners work together for several years and hence the candidate may benefit from the experience, scholarship, creative imagination and critical insight of second-year senior academics at a time when their advice can be of maximum usefulness.

(3) The old tradition of the defence of doctoral theses has survived in a modified form in many universities. The possibility of a public debate on the thesis is the best guarantee of justice and fairness when a thesis is severely criticized by the examiners. The institution of a public debate deters examiners from making rash and irresponsible statements, and provides the candidate with an opportunity to defend his or her theories, an opportunity which the Australian system denies.

(4) In many North American universities examination committees are chosen from outside the candidate’s major discipline. Such an examiner may provide the necessary balance, independence and detachment often needed in the assessment of academic research.

(5) Supervisors and examiners are expected, as a general rule, to hold qualifications at least equal to those sought by the candidate. This is far from being the case in Australian universities, and such a situation may lead to intolerable bias, or even hostility, even though this may be difficult to prove.

(6) Examiners are usually informed of the extent to which the supervisor is responsible for the premises, assumptions, methodological orientation and the content of a thesis. In the Australian system the supervisor may act quite irresponsibly, and the candidate alone will be penalised for the supervisor’s errors of judgement.
The middle grade is called the candidature of sciences and corresponds to the degree in Australia of the Master of Arts.

The higher degree of Doctorate embraces all the faculties, human and exact sciences.

The Candidature of Sciences

The candidate is examined in a public examination. He has to defend in an open discussion the reports of two examiners (opponents), after three years of research work guided by a faculty professor or a non-matured scientist. The names of the opponents, delegated by the Academy, are not disclosed in advance, but the candidate receives their written reports signed.

An open forum (debates) is required in addition to the oral examination to win the degree. (The procedure of the open forum is similar as described below.)

In exceptional cases, verified scientific work the three years' period is negotiable and the examination might be disposed of, but the open forum discussion is compulsory. After the successful defence the aspirant wins the degree of The Candidate of Science.

The Higher Degree of Doctor of Science

This degree corresponds with what we in Australia call Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Economy, etc.

This degree can be attained only after a further two years course following the above degree of The Candidate of Science. The candidate has to submit to the Academy, this thesis is to be prepared fully and independently and entirely free from consultation with professors or supervisors. Three examiners (opponents) are delegated by the Academy, two of whom must already be Doctors of Science.

The condition in both cases (M.A. and/or Ph.D.) is that the theses must present new, significant and original findings.

A short summary of these findings will be printed and sent out by the Academy to all graduates of the institution, informing them of the dates and place of the debate. This information should be advertised in the newspapers.

The discussion will be open, any qualified person can be present, and anybody may contribute. The examiners (opponents) will declare the thesis fit and complete for debate. If, out of the delegated three examiners, two reject the debate, the candidate may still insist that his paper should be presented to the open discussion.

The acceptance of the paper will be decided by a simple majority from the five-member committee, through secret ballot.

Appendix II

Presenting the graduate Adviser's Handbook (1977-78) to the chairman and members of the qualifying examination committee. Or Sanford S. Elberg, Dean (University of California, Berkeley), said:

To: Chairman and Members of Qualifying Examination Committee

From: Sanford S. Elberg, Dean

In order to maintain the traditional quality and scope of the examinations, I would like to present to you some of our thinking concerning the examinations, as it has emerged in discussions of the Graduate Council's Administrative Committee. It is assumed at the outset that all of you know that the student must be registered the quarter when the examination is taken.

Before the examination begins, the chairman and members of the committee should review the candidate's preparation and how it relates to the degree specified in the letter of admission to the student. In Schools in which a professional doctoral degree is offered in addition to the Ph.D. degree, the committee should be very aware of the specific degree for which the examination is being conducted. The examination itself should demonstrate the candidate's capacity to synthesize and present the factual information and training in techniques吸收ed through course work and seminar research. The knowledge to be examined at this juncture is not just the sum total of the smaller provinces of knowledge required in course work and tested by routine final examinations and term papers; it should be more as regards breadth, depth, and knowledge as regards the recital of bare facts. Although the examination is designed to test the candidate's readiness to enter the research phase of graduate studies, it is not to be concerned solely with a dissertation prospectus. Testing the student's general mastery of the subject as regarded as an essential part of the examination.

The qualifying examinations are a Graduate Division and Council matter and the examination should also reflect non-course requirements of the candidate. The student should be able to handle the outside subject on its own terms as well as to appreciate its relevance to the major field of interest.

The chairman is expected to ensure that the examination is handled fairly for both the committee and the student. During the oral phase of a qualifying examination, the chairman should do all in his power to put the student at ease at the outset of the examination, perhaps by asking the student a few general questions about his personal or professional nature before the examination in formal fields of knowledge begins.

Should it become necessary for the committee to discuss the progress of the examination and the student is asked to leave the room, an explanation should be given of what is happening, to alleviate any undue concern. It should be the committee's prerogative to ensure that the candidate is not driven to distraction by an excessive application of this procedure. It is also the tradition that the candidate's right to proceed in the examination, and the right to return to the presence of the examiners, should be preserved. It is the chairmen's prerogative to ensure that the candidate is not driven to distraction by an excessive application of this procedure. It is also the tradition that the candidate's right to proceed in the examination, and the right to return to the presence of the examiners, should be preserved.

In evaluating the student's performance in the qualifying examination, each member of the committee should be polled and the vote recorded. Split votes, and votes not cast when the question is put, count equally in the vote tally. (None of these rules is to be recommended.) The chairmen should record the decision and sign the final report.

Non-voting observers who are members or visiting members of the faculty may be invited or not, upon the chairman's discretion. The candidate should be allowed to carry out the examination in the presence of a faculty member who knows the candidate well but who does not participate in the examination may be a strong support to the student.

In summary, I am most concerned that the student be given as completely fair an examination as is humanly possible, and that committee members feel free to express themselves to me personally if they feel that all or part of the examination was not conducted in a fair and reasonable manner.

The purpose of these suggestions is to try to humanize an inherently difficult process, is not without lowering of standard or loss of scholarship. Ideally, this examination should be a great experience and a source of deep educational concern. A residue of failure is inevitable; but frictions, known or unknown, are for the most part avoidable.

The student may be recommended for completion of the Candidate in Philosophy (C. Phil) degree (when offered by the department or group) upon successful completion of the Ph.D. qualifying examinations and formal advancement to candidacy; i.e. the student is believed to possess the intellecual capacity to complete the requirements for the Ph.D. degree and the department is ready to provide space or facilities as needed for the Ph.D. degree programs itself.

Appendix I

Procedures for Gaining Equivalent Degrees to the Master of Arts; and Doctor of Philosophy in Hungary under the scientific Academy of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences Bachelor of Arts; Master of Arts; Doctor of Philosophy.