

## Steve's submission

I

**From:** Richard Jones  
**To:** Ivor Hanlon  
**Subject:** Steve Brown  
**Date sent:** Tue, 6 Sep 2005 16:58:52 +0100  
**Copies to:** x, y, z

Dear Ivor,

We have now had Alan's report on Steve's PhD thesis; I am attaching Alan's feedback here. I am sorry to report that it is the view of the Department, endorsed by Jeff as HOD, that Steve's work should not go forward for a PhD with the Department's support. It is clearly not of the required standard. Steve has had a very long time to produce this work and unfortunately it is still full of basic errors and flaws (including on the front page!) - let alone all the academic problems that Alan has picked up on. Steve should be told that we recommend submitting for an MPhil by research, but it should be emphasised that even in this case, the work would have to be very carefully corrected and edited prior to submission. In addition, there is an issue of word length as current University guidelines suggest an MPhil by research should be around 40 - 60,000 words, substantially less than a PhD.

I would be grateful if you could contact Jeff and myself to let us know what Steve decides to do, on the basis of this feedback.

Kind regards,  
Richard

**Q1 What should Steve do now?**

**Q2 What factors should he take into account?**

**In fact Steve decides to ignore this advice and submit his thesis as it stands. 10 months later he receives the following letter:**

Mr Steve Brown  
22 November 2006

Dear Mr Brown,

**Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy:  
'The Embodiment of Emotional Intelligence: the Nodular Structure of the Affect Program'**

Dr Hanlon has passed on to me the reports of the examining committee into your thesis as above.

Both reports are very positive and recommend the award of the degree subject to minor corrections and the thesis being hardbound in accordance with the University's guidelines. Given the unequivocal endorsement of both examiners, the Academic Secretary has agreed to waive the requirement to attend for a *viva voce* examination. For Senate to decide to award the degree, therefore, you must complete the corrections, as set out below, within one month of receipt of this letter and submit two hardbound copies of the thesis to the Research Degrees Office. I enclose the University's guidance on the form and presentation of research theses.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate you on the thesis and I look forward to receiving the hardbound copies in order to present your name to Senate.

With best wishes

Dr P D Smith  
Deputy Registrar

Minor Corrections Required – Steve Brown

1. A thorough proofread to eradicate a few remaining types, e.g. pp.72, 163; it is suggest that this be carried out by eye rather than by spellchecker.
2. Excision of the appendix (pp.359-62).
3. Removal of references to talks and public presentations.

**Q1 What should Steve do now?**

**Q2 Has he any grounds for complaint or compensation?**

Steve looks at the University website:

http://www.....

### **Code of Practice for Supervised Postgraduate Research**

#### **Requirement to Hold Viva Voce Examinations**

**(6.14) The University's PhD Regulations and MD Regulations require that each candidate for these Degrees must submit to a *viva voce* examination and that this requirement shall only be waived in special circumstances with the express approval of the appropriate Faculty Board. In this context "special" circumstances does not include the examiners regarding the thesis as being unequivocally acceptable.**

(6.15) The Regulations governing the award of **Master's Degrees by research** vary in their requirements but the norm is for candidates to submit to a *viva voce* examination.

**QI What should Steve do now?**

---

**Team task:**

**On the acetate provided list the main lessons here for**

1. **postgraduate students**
2. **supervisors**
3. **institutions**

---