

# Appendix F3 Additional Data and Documents

National Review of Doctoral Qualifications										
Graduate Attributes assessed in current Faculty Instructions to Examiners										
KNOWLEDGE										
ATTRIBUTE	AgriSci	Arts	Education	EMS	Engineering	Law	Medicine	Military	Science	Theology
1 Broad, well-informed, and current knowledge of field or discipline	Does the dissertation distinguish clearly between own, new contributions to and known results in the relevant field of study? Is the candidate capable of placing the results in context within the existing knowledge in the field of study? Is there evidence of conversance with ...related literature?	Is there adequate delimitation & conceptualising of the field and subject of research?	Does the dissertation reveal an understanding of the purpose & nature and extent of the investigation? Does the dissertation show sufficient familiarity with the interpretation of relevant literature? Is there a proper theoretical ... grounding?	Is there explicit demarcation and conceptualising of the research field and topic? Adequate knowledge of the relevant literature?	Does the candidate demonstrate familiarity with the relevant research literature?	Do the research results...show insight in the relevant field of study? And conversance and critical attitude towards related literature? Is the candidate capable of placing the results in context with the existing knowledge in the field of study?	Has there been sufficient demarcation of the research field and conceptualisation of the research topic?	Is there sufficient delimitation & conceptualising of the research field and topic? Does the candidate demonstrate familiarity with the relevant literature?	Does the dissertation distinguish clearly between own, new contributions to and known results in the relevant field of study? Is the candidate capable of placing the results in context within the existing knowledge in the field of study? Is there evidence of conversance with ...related literature?	Is there sufficient delimitation & conceptualising of the research field and topic? Does the candidate demonstrate familiarity with the relevant literature?
2 Expert, specialised, and in-depth current knowledge of specific area of research	Does the dissertation distinguish clearly between own, new contributions to and known results in the relevant field of study? Are the research results acceptable for publication?	Is there adequate delimitation & conceptualising of the field and subject of research? Does the candidate show familiarity with the relevant literature?	Does the candidate show an understanding of the purpose & nature and extent of the investigation? Sufficient familiarity with the interpretation of relevant literature? Is there a proper theoretical ... grounding?	Is there explicit demarcation and conceptualising of the research field and topic? Adequate knowledge of the relevant literature?	Does the candidate show familiarity with the relevant research literature? The extent to which the work is publishable in a professional, peer-reviewed journal?	Does the dissertation distinguish between own, new contributions to & known results in the relevant field of study? Is the candidate capable of placing the results in context with the existing knowledge in the field of study?	Has there been sufficient demarcation of the research field and conceptualisation of the research topic?	Is there sufficient delimitation & conceptualising of the research field and topic? Familiarity with the relevant literature?	Does the dissertation distinguish clearly between own, new contributions to and known results in the relevant field of study? Are the research results acceptable for publication?	Is there sufficient delimitation & conceptualising of the research field and topic? Familiarity with the relevant literature?
3 Insight into the interconnectedness of one's topic of research with other cognate fields	Exposure to this through extensive reading; discussions with peers and promotor; attending cross-disciplinary colloquia & various symposiums and conferences, etc.	Exposure to this through extensive reading; discussions with peers and promotor; attending cross-disciplinary colloquia & various symposiums and conferences, etc.	Exposure to this through extensive reading; discussions with peers and promotor; attending cross-disciplinary colloquia & various symposiums and conferences, etc.	Exposure to this through extensive reading; discussions with peers and promotor; attending cross-disciplinary colloquia & various symposiums and conferences, etc.	Exposure to this through extensive reading; discussions with peers and promotor; attending cross-disciplinary colloquia & various symposiums and conferences, etc.	Is the candidate capable of evaluating the scientific meaning of his/her results & placing the results in context with the existing knowledge in the field of study? Does the dissertation show conversance with and a critical attitude towards related literature?	Exposure to this through extensive reading; discussions with peers and promotor; attending cross-disciplinary colloquia & various symposiums and conferences, etc.	Exposure to this through extensive reading; discussions with peers and promotor; attending cross-disciplinary colloquia & various symposiums and conferences, etc.	Exposure to this through extensive reading; discussions with peers and promotor; attending cross-disciplinary colloquia & various symposiums and conferences, etc.	Exposure to this through extensive reading; discussions with peers and promotor; attending cross-disciplinary colloquia & various symposiums and conferences, etc.
4 Ethics awareness in research and professional conduct	Is implicit in the dissertation. Covered in methodology section, during proposal development & ethics clearance process, for example.	Is implicit in the dissertation. Covered in methodology section, during proposal development & ethics clearance process, for example.	Is implicit in the dissertation. Covered in methodology section, during proposal development & ethics clearance process, for example.	Is implicit in the dissertation. Covered in methodology section, during proposal development & ethics clearance process, for example.	Is implicit in the dissertation. Covered in methodology section, during proposal development & ethics clearance process, for example.	Is implicit in the dissertation. Covered in methodology section, during proposal development & ethics clearance process, for example.	Is implicit in the dissertation. Covered in methodology section, during proposal development & ethics clearance process, for example.	Is implicit in the dissertation. Covered in methodology section, during proposal development & ethics clearance process, for example.	Is implicit in the dissertation. Covered in methodology section, during proposal development & ethics clearance process, for example.	Is implicit in the dissertation. Covered in methodology section, during proposal development & ethics clearance process, for example.
5 An original contribution to the field of study	Do the research results constitute a meaningful contribution to the knowledge of and insight in the relevant field of study? ... or other signs of originality?	Take into account the contribution made by the dissertation to knowledge in its field.	Does the candidate demonstrate comprehensive & profound research? Does the dissertation make an original contribution to the enrichment of knowledge in the chosen field & with evidence of independent critical conclusions...?	Does the dissertation make an adequate contribution to the knowledge of the chosen field of study?	Has the criteria of originality of the work & novelty of contribution been met? The extent to which the work is publishable in a professional, peer-reviewed journal?	Do the research results constitute a meaningful contribution to the knowledge of & insight in the relevant field of study? Does the dissertation distinguish between own, new contributions to & known results in the relevant field of study?	Does the dissertation make an original contribution to the established body of knowledge on the particular subject?	Does the dissertation make a contribution to the knowledge in the relevant subject?	Do the research results constitute a meaningful contribution to the knowledge of and insight in the relevant field of study? ... or other signs of originality?	Does the dissertation make a contribution to the knowledge in the relevant subject?

		SKILLS									
	ATTRIBUTE	AgriSci	Arts	Education	EMS	Engineering	Law	Medicine	Military	Science	Theology
6	Evaluation, selection and application of appropriate research approaches, methodologies, and processes in the pursuit of a research objective	Is the candidate sufficiently familiar with the relevant research techniques & methods? Is the candidate capable of evaluating the scientific meaning of his/her results?	Is there adequate command of the relevant research method?	Does the dissertation offer proof that the candidate can formulate clear research questions ... and can make well-grounded research methodological choices? Demonstrate skill & creativity in the selection & use of research methods...?	Adequate control of the relevant research methodology? Detailed description of the research methodology used in the study?	Sound research methods & interpretation of research results?	Does the dissertation show that the candidate is sufficiently familiar with the relevant research techniques & methods?	Keep in mind whether there is sufficient mastery of the appropriate research methodology? Is there proper documentation and substantiation of research results?	Does the candidate show command of the relevant research method?	Is the candidate sufficiently familiar with the relevant research techniques & methods? Is the candidate capable of evaluating the scientific meaning of his/her results?	Does the candidate show command of the relevant research method?
7	Reflection and autonomy	Is the candidate sufficiently capable of independent research?	Is there proper documentation & support of the results of independent research?	Is there evidence of independent, critical conclusions? Is the dissertation of such a quality that it ought to be published in a suitable scholarly journal or book?	Is there explicit demarcation and conceptualising of the research field and topic?	Is there proper documentation & support of the results of independent research?	Does the candidate show signs of independent, critical thinking and originality? Does the candidate show that he/she is sufficiently capable of doing independent research?	Keep in mind the independent, critical judgement of the candidate.	Is there sufficient delimitation & conceptualisation of the research field & topic?	Is the candidate sufficiently capable of independent research?	Is there sufficient delimitation & conceptualisation of the research field & topic?
8	Communication skills, including relevant information and digital literacy skills and research dissemination skills to expert and non-expert audiences alike	Is the material presented in a clear, systematic & logical manner? Is the linguistic, stylistic & technical editing of the dissertation acceptable? Further dissemination skills are developed through conferences & less formal science communication events at which to present, for example.	Keep in mind a clear and, systematic presentation of the material and logical exposition of the argument? Demonstrates acceptable linguistic and stylistic presentation? Further dissemination skills are developed through conferences & less formal science communication events at which to present, for example.	Demonstrates a systematic, well-founded & coherent means of presentation? Accepted linguistic & technical conventions of presentation of research? Further dissemination skills are developed through conferences & less formal science communication events at which to present, for example.	Is there proper documentation & reporting of the research results? Acceptable use of language and stylistics? Further dissemination skills are developed through conferences & less formal science communication events at which to present, for example.	Is there acceptable linguistic & stylistic presentation? A clear & systematic presentation of the material...? Further dissemination skills are developed through conferences & less formal science communication events at which to present, for example.	Have the motivation & study objective been formulated satisfactorily? Is the material presented in a clear, systematic & logical manner? Is the linguistic, stylistic & technical representation of the dissertation acceptable? Further dissemination skills are developed through conferences & less formal science communication events at which to present, for example.	Keep in mind is there a clear, systematic & logical presentation of material? Acceptable presentation in terms of grammar & style? Further dissemination skills are developed through conferences & less formal science communication events at which to present, for example.	Is the dissertation in accordance with clear, systematic & logical presentation of the material? Acceptable linguistic & stylistic editing? Further dissemination skills are developed through conferences & less formal science communication events at which to present, for example.	Is the material presented in a clear, systematic & logical manner? Is the linguistic, stylistic & technical editing of the dissertation acceptable? Further dissemination skills are developed through conferences & less formal science communication events at which to present, for example.	Is the dissertation in accordance with clear, systematic & logical presentation of the material? Acceptable linguistic & stylistic editing? Further dissemination skills are developed through conferences & less formal science communication events at which to present, for example.
9	Critical and analytical thinking for problem-solving	Does the dissertation show conversance with & a critical attitude towards related literature? Is the candidate capable of evaluating the scientific meaning of his/her results? Does the candidate show signs of independent, critical thinking ...?	Is there adequate delimitation & conceptualising of the field and subject of research? Does the dissertation have clear and systematic presentation of the material and logical exposition of the argument?	Is there evidence of independent, critical conclusions & personal recommendations? Is there competence in analysing, interpreting & critically assessing data w.r.t. the meaning /importance of the findings?	Does the dissertation have clear & systematic presentation of the material & logical exposition of the argument? Is there proper & correct interpretation of the research results?	Demonstrates a sound interpretation of the research results? Logical exposition of the argument?	Is the candidate capable of evaluating the scientific meaning of his/her results & placing the results in context with the existing knowledge in the field of study? Does the candidate show signs of independent, critical thinking and originality? Does the dissertation show conversance with and a critical attitude towards related literature?	Is there sufficient mastery of the appropriate research methodology and problem-solving? Keep in mind 'the ... critical judgement of the candidate'.	Is there sufficient delimitation & conceptualisation of the research field & topic? Clear, systematic and logical presentation? Proper documentation & verification of the research results?	Does the dissertation show conversance with & a critical attitude towards related literature? Is the candidate capable of evaluating the scientific meaning of his/her results? Does the candidate show signs of independent, critical thinking...?	Is there sufficient delimitation & conceptualisation of the research field & topic? Clear, systematic and logical presentation? Proper documentation & verification of the research results?

## **SU Faculty Doctoral Examiner Instructions and Forms**

AgriSciences

Arts and Social Sciences

Education

Economic Management Sciences

Engineering

Law

Medicine & Health Sciences

Military

Science

Theology

**Click on the faculty names above to jump to their forms**



UNIVERSITEIT  
iYUNIVESITHI  
STELLENBOSCH  
UNIVERSITY

100  
1918-2018



## AgriSciences

**NOTE TO EXAMINERS:** You may use any one of the following three sending options for the completed form A and report B: (i) send the original, signed form and report via the **postal** or **courier** services; OR (ii) **fax** the original, signed form and report; OR (iii) send the original form and report via **e-mail**, preferably in **pdf format**.

### Contact details for the Examinations Officer: AgriSciences

Ms Karin Vergeer  
Stellenbosch University  
JS Marais Building, room 1027, Victoria Street, Stellenbosch  
Private Bag X1, 7602 Matieland, South Africa  
Fax: 021-808-2001 (international +27-21-808-2001)  
E-mail: ccav@sun.ac.za

### **Deadline for receipt of form and report:**

[\[Click here and type departmental deadline\]](#)

#### INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMINERS FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF A DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

The reports of the examiners will be treated as confidential and only technical details will be conveyed to the candidate.

1. EXAMINERS must please complete the **examiner's report form (A)**, in which a specific recommendation must be made.
2. EXAMINERS must also submit an **assessment report on the dissertation (B)** (approximately 2 pages), taking into account the following criteria:
  - Has the motivation for the objectives of the specific research been formulated satisfactorily?
  - Do the research results constitute a meaningful contribution to the knowledge of and insight in the relevant field of study?
  - Does the dissertation distinguish clearly between own, new contributions to and known results in the relevant field of study?
  - Is the candidate capable of evaluating the scientific meaning of his/her results and of placing this in context within existing knowledge in the field of study?
  - Does the candidate show signs of independent, critical thinking or other signs of originality?
  - Does the candidate show that he/she is sufficiently capable of doing independent research?
  - Does the dissertation show that the candidate is sufficiently familiar with the relevant research techniques and methods?
  - Does the dissertation show conversance with and a critical attitude towards related literature?
  - Is the material presented in a clear, systematic and logical manner?
  - Is the linguistic, stylistic and technical editing of the dissertation acceptable?
  - Are the research results acceptable for publication?
3. The Faculty of AgriSciences does not expect examiners to provide a summary of the dissertation, and ask that you rather concentrate on an assessment of the work that is presented to you.

**NOTES TO SUPERVISORS:**

1. Use this form to create a separate electronic form for each examiner. Please complete sections 1 and 2 on the form before sending the form, together with the dissertation, to the examiners.
2. Candidates and Supervisors are reminded that a dissertation has to have a separate chapter that synthesises the work that has been done (i.e. that focusses on the implications of the research findings) even if a collection of publishable articles is presented.

**(A) EXAMINER'S REPORT FORM (DOCTORAL DISSERTATION)****1. EXAMINER**

<b>Title, initial(s) and surname</b>			
<b>Address</b>			
<b>Tel. no.</b>		<b>E-mail</b>	
<b>Status of examiner</b>	<b>Unattached and internal</b>		
	<b>Unattached and external</b>		

**2. STUDENT (CANDIDATE)**

<b>Title, initial(s) and surname</b>			
<b>Degree</b>		<b>Field of study</b>	
<b>Title of dissertation</b>			

**3. RECOMMENDATION**

**NOTE TO EXAMINER:** Please mark **ONE** of the following options a – e.

I have examined the abovementioned candidate's dissertation and recommend that:

- ☐ (a) The **degree be awarded** to the candidate.
- ☐ (b) Provided certain **editorial and/or factual/textual corrections** are made to the satisfaction of the supervisor, the degree be awarded to the candidate.
- ☐ (c) Provided certain **factual or textual corrections** are made to the satisfaction of the examiner, the degree be awarded to the candidate. **NOTE: A written confirmation by the examiner that the corrections have been made to his/her satisfaction must be sent by e-mail or fax to both the supervisor and examination officer.**
- ☐ (d) The candidate be given an opportunity to **revise and resubmit the dissertation**.  
**See Section 4.**
- ☐ (e) The **dissertation should not be accepted**.

<b>Signature of examiner</b>		<b>Date</b>	

#### 4. FINAL RECOMMENDATION FOR **REVISED DISSERTATION**

**NOTE TO SUPERVISOR AND EXAMINER:** This section is only applicable if an examiner selected recommendation (d) in section 3. Please do not send this page when the dissertation is reviewed for the first time. The supervisor should then send the revised dissertation, together with this part of the form, to the examiner for completion, signing and returning by letter, fax or e-mail for his/her final recommendation.

##### SUPERVISOR

Title, initial(s) and surname			
Tel. no.		E-mail	

##### EXAMINER

Title, initial(s) and surname			
Tel. no.		E-mail	

##### STUDENT (CANDIDATE)

Title, initial(s) and surname	
Title of dissertation	

I have examined the candidate's **revised dissertation** and recommend that:

- ☐ (a) The **degree be awarded** to the candidate.
- ☐ (b) Provided certain **editorial and/or factual/textual corrections** are made to the satisfaction of the supervisor, the degree be awarded to the candidate.
- ☐ (c) Provided certain **factual or textual corrections** are made to the satisfaction of the examiner, the degree be awarded to the candidate. **NOTE: A written confirmation by the examiner that the corrections have been made to his/her satisfaction must be sent by e-mail or fax to both the supervisor and examination officer.**
- ☐ (d) The candidate be given an opportunity to **revise and resubmit the dissertation**.  
**See Section 4.**
- ☐ (e) The **dissertation should not be accepted**.

Signature of examiner		Date	
-----------------------	--	------	--

**EXAMINER, please send to: Examinations Officer: AgriSciences**

Ms Karin Vergeer  
Stellenbosch University  
JS Marais Building, room 1027, Victoria Street, Stellenbosch  
Private Bag X1, 7602 Matieland, South Africa  
Fax: 021-808-2001 (international +27-21-808-2001)  
E-mail: ccav@sun.ac.za

**Deadline for receipt of form and report:**

**[Click [here](#) and type departmental deadline]**

**NOTE TO EXAMINERS:** Complete report; approximately 2 pages

**(B) ASSESSMENT REPORT ON DISSERTATION**

---

**Examiner:**

**Student:**

**Dissertation title:**

**Report**

<b>Signature of examiner</b>		<b>Date</b>	
------------------------------	--	-------------	--



## **Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences**

### **INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMINERS FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS**

*N.B. The reports of the examiners will be treated as confidential and will be made available to the candidate only with the examiner's explicit permission. See point 5 below.*

1. The examining of dissertations comprises two complementary processes: the independent assessment of the dissertation by each examiner in the form of a written report, and an oral examination, where the examination committee (the examiners chaired by the non-examining chair) and the candidate engage in a conversation about the dissertation. The written reports of the examiners remain the primary evaluation instruments in the sense that they determine whether the candidate passes or not. The report written in accordance with the criteria below should be 1,200-1,500 words or 3-5 pages long. The examiners' reports are circulated by the PEO amongst the examiners prior to the oral examination. The oral examination provides the opportunity for the examiners to clarify issues discussed in the written reports or other issues which might arise. The oral examination is a secondary evaluation instrument. Examiners may, if they wish, hand in an additional report after the oral, but this seldom happens in practice.
2. Each examiner submits a written report which is an independent evaluation of the dissertation in accordance with a set of general assessment criteria. The expectation is that examiners will stay within the criteria, give a clear statement of how the candidate meets each of the criteria and elucidate these statements with examples from the dissertation. The examiners may comment on any aspect of the dissertation which is not covered by the criteria.

The assessment should take into account the following general criteria:

- i. Adequate delimitation and conceptualising of the field and subject of research;
  - ii. Adequate command of the relevant research method;
  - iii. Familiarity with the relevant literature;
  - iv. Clear and systematic presentation of the material and logical exposition of the argument;
  - v. Proper documentation and support of the results of independent research;
  - vi. Acceptable linguistic and stylistic presentation;
  - vii. The contribution made by the dissertation to knowledge in its field.
3. Each examiner is required to comment in the report on the suitability of all or parts of the dissertation for publication.
4. In addition to the examiner's written report a Standard Report Form (Addendum H(ii)) which reflects his/her final assessment should also be submitted.



5. Each examiner must indicate whether or not his/her comments or parts of them may be made available to the candidate.

The report should be directed only to:

Nicky Steenstra  
Postgraduate Examinations Office  
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences  
University of Stellenbosch  
Private Bag X1  
MATIELAND  
7602  
Republic of South Africa

Fax: +27 (0)21 808 2123  
E-mail: [nicky@sun.ac.za](mailto:nicky@sun.ac.za)

**NB** It is the **function of the Postgraduate Examinations Office** to communicate the examiner's findings, via the non-examining chair, to the other examiners and the supervisor. The report and form should thus **not be sent** directly to either the supervisor or departmental chair.



## STANDARD REPORT FORM FOR AN EXAMINER OF A DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

1. ADDRESS FOR SUBMISSION OF THIS REPORT BY THE EXAMINER (i.e. NOT to supervisor or department)

Postgraduate Examinations Office  
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences  
(Arts building Room 483)  
University of Stellenbosch  
Private Bag X1  
MATIELAND  
7602  
Republic of South Africa

Fax: +27 (0)21 808 2123  
E-mail: [nicky@sun.ac.za](mailto:nicky@sun.ac.za)

2. PARTICULARS OF EXAMINER

Title, initials and surname ( <i>in capitals</i> )	
Institution ( <i>if applicable</i> )	
Phone number	
E-mail address	

3. PARTICULARS OF CANDIDATE

Title, full initials and surname	
Student number	
Degree ( <i>e.g. PhD (Visual Arts)</i> )	
Full title of dissertation	

#### 4. RECOMMENDATION BY EXAMINER

I have examined the candidate's dissertation and recommend that: *{please mark ONE block only}*

- |   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| (a) the degree be awarded to the candidate.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) the degree may be conferred upon the candidate, provided that the revision, in accordance with the recommendations of the examiners, is completed to the satisfaction of the supervisor ( <i>i.e. the examiners do <u>not</u> receive the dissertation again.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) the degree may be conferred upon the candidate, provided that a material revision is completed to the satisfaction of the examiners, as agreed upon by the examination panel ( <i>i.e. the examiners <u>must approve</u> the revisions).</i>                      | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (d) the degree may not be conferred on the dissertation in its current form; the candidate must revise and resubmit the dissertation.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (e) the degree may not be conferred upon the candidate and the work may not be resubmitted for examination.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |

#### 5. RELEASE OF THE REPORT TO THE CANDIDATE

Please mark ONE of the following blocks:

- |   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| I agree that my report may be made available to the candidate.                            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I agree that excerpts from my report may be made available to the candidate.              | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I prefer that my report be made available to the candidate anonymously.                   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I prefer that excerpts from my report may be made available to the candidate anonymously. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I prefer that my report (or excerpts from it) may not be made available to the candidate. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

---

Signature of Examiner

---

Date

## FACULTY OF EDUCATION

### STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY

---

#### **DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS: GUIDELINES FOR EXAMINERS**

##### **1. The work that is submitted to you for examination is a Doctoral dissertation.**

Examiners are expected to work independently of one another in evaluating candidates' work. Supervisors may, however, be consulted to clarify aspects of a particular study or the context within which it was undertaken.

##### **2. The requirements are as follows:**

A Doctoral dissertation is normally between 70 000 and 90 000 words in length and demonstrates comprehensive and profound research at doctoral level. The dissertation should offer proof that the candidate can formulate clear research questions or hypotheses and can make well-grounded research methodological choices in order to deal with these questions/hypotheses. A thorough and comprehensive literature study, systematic data collection and coherent data analysis and interpretation are essential. The dissertation must make an original contribution to the enrichment of knowledge in the chosen field, with evidence of independent, critical conclusions and personal recommendations in the light of findings by the candidate. Furthermore, the dissertation should be of such quality that it ought to be published in a suitable scholarly journal or book.

**Oral  
exam**

**An oral examination is required for the degree of Doctor and shall be conducted within three weeks after all the reports has been received.**

##### **3. Recommendation form and narrative report**

Examiners are required to complete the accompanying recommendation form and a comprehensive narrative report (see Appendix A for guidelines), and return it by email to Ms Sally le Roux at [mlr1@sun.ac.za](mailto:mlr1@sun.ac.za).

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION**  
**UNIVERSITY OF STELLENBOSCH**

---

**EXAMINER'S RECOMMENDATION FORM AND NARRATIVE REPORT**

**PLEASE COMPLETE THE RECOMMENDATION FORM AND THE NARRATIVE REPORT**

<b>Title of dissertation:</b>
<b>Candidate:</b>
<b>Examiner:</b>

**SECTION A: RECOMMENDATION: (please tick the appropriate box)**

I have examined this dissertation and recommend that:

- |    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 1) | the candidate should be awarded the degree subject to addressing the <u>minor corrections/comments and typographical errors</u> raised by the examiner(s), to the satisfaction of the supervisor. | <input style="width: 50px; height: 50px;" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2) | the candidate should be awarded the degree subject to <u>specified changes</u> being made to the dissertation to the satisfaction of the supervisor.  | <input style="width: 50px; height: 50px;" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3) | the candidate should be invited to address the <u>substantive concerns</u> of the examiner(s) and to revise and resubmit the thesis for re-examination.   | <input style="width: 50px; height: 50px;" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4) | the degree should not be awarded to the candidate.  | <input style="width: 50px; height: 50px;" type="checkbox"/> |

**PERMISSION**

That the name of the examiner may be disclosed to the candidate

**YES**

**NO**

**SECTION B: COMPREHENSIVE NARRATIVE REPORT (See Appendix A for guidelines)**  
(You may extend this table to two or more pages or submit it as a separate report.)

--

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

# **APPENDIX A**

---

## **GUIDELINES FOR COMPILING EXAMINERS' NARRATIVE REPORTS**

Examiners may consider the following guidelines in compiling narrative reports. The type of study (Course Master's/Research Master's/Doctoral dissertation) will naturally determine the weight of the various guidelines. A report is normally written in the form of a detailed discussion and analysis of the study and includes a critical evaluation of the success of the study.

Candidate demonstrates:

1. an understanding of the purpose, nature and extent of the investigation.
2. sufficient familiarity with the interpretation of relevant literature for his/her research.
3. a proper theoretical and methodological grounding.
4. skill and creativity in the selection and use of research methods, techniques and strategies.
5. a systematic, well-founded and coherent means of presentation.
6. competence in analysing, interpreting and critically assessing data with regard to the meaning/importance of the findings.
7. accepted linguistic and technical conventions of presentation of research.

As amended by FB: 11/05/2018

## FACULTY OF ECONOMIC AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

### INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMINERS FOR THE EXAMINATION OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

**Please Note:** The reports of the examiners are treated as confidential and only technical details are conveyed to the candidate.

1. Each examiner must submit an independent evaluation in the form of a written report in accordance with the general criteria specified below. An examiner may not contact the candidate, the supervisor(s) or the other examiners under any circumstances. If there are any administrative enquiries they need to be sent to Ms Annali Maass ([apaint@sun.ac.za](mailto:apaint@sun.ac.za)) or academic related matters to Prof Christo Boshoff, Vice-Dean: Research ([cboshoff@sun.ac.za](mailto:cboshoff@sun.ac.za))

The report should be compiled using the following general criteria but need not be limited to these criteria:

- (a) Explicit demarcation and conceptualising of the research field and topic;
  - (b) Adequate control of the relevant research methodology;
  - (c) Adequate knowledge of the relevant literature;
  - (d) Clear and systematic presentation of the material and a logical exposition of the argument;
  - (e) Detailed description of the research methodology used in the study;
  - (f) Proper documentation and reporting of the research results;
  - (g) Proper and correct interpretation of the research results;
  - (h) Acceptable use of language and stylistics; and
  - (i) Whether the dissertation makes an adequate contribution to the knowledge of the chosen field of study.
2. Apart from the written report, each examiner also completes the attached standard report form in which an explicit recommendation is made. **Please indicate whether, according to your examination if we can proceed with an oral examination.**

**APPROVED 26 JULY 2019**



# FACULTY OF ECONOMIC AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

## REPORT FORM FOR THE EXAMINING OF A DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

1. To: Prof Christo Boshoff  
Vice-Dean: Research  
Faculty of Economic and Management Sciences  
Stellenbosch University  
MATIELAND 7602

From: Prof/Dr/Mr/Ms/Mrs/Miss:.....

University/Work address: .....

2. Candidate: .....
3. Field of study: .....
4. Full dissertation topic: .....  
.....
5. Recommendation (mark only **one** of these sub-sections):

(A)	I recommend that the dissertation be accepted unconditionally and that the PhD be awarded. <b><i>In this case a PhD oral defence will still be arranged.</i></b>
(B)	I have examined the PhD dissertation and recommend that it be amended based on my recommendations and those of the other examiners and <b><i>that it should thereafter</i></b> be ready for final consideration during an oral defence.
(C)	I have examined the PhD dissertation and believe that it should be amended based on my recommendations and those of the other examiners and <b><i>then be re-submitted for examination.</i></b> If this option is selected the oral defence will only be arranged once all examiners have selected either the A or B-option above, following the re-examination.
(D)	I recommend that the dissertation not be accepted.

.....  
Signature of examiner

.....  
Date

# FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

## EXAMINER'S REPORT FORM (PhD)

### 1. DISSERTATION DETAILS:

PhD CANDIDATE:

TITLE OF  
DISSERTATION:

### 2. ASSESSING THE DISSERTATION:

For the degree Doctor of Philosophy in Engineering, the dissertation must provide clear and convincing evidence of original work and must make a significant, novel contribution to knowledge in the field of study concerned.

**The examiner is kindly requested to evaluate the dissertation and *submit a separate, written report* in accordance with the seven criteria listed below.**

*Select the criteria that have been met:*

- ☐ Originality of the work and novelty of contribution.
- ☐ Extent to which the work is publishable in a professional, peer-reviewed journal.
- ☐ Familiarity with the relevant research literature.
- ☐ Sound research methods and interpretation of research results.
- ☐ Clear and systematic presentation of the material and logical exposition of the argument.
- ☐ Proper documentation and support of the results of independent research.
- ☐ Acceptable linguistic and stylistic presentation.

### 3. RATING THE DISSERTATION:

The examiner is requested to rate the dissertation by selecting only one of the categories listed below (*place an X in the appropriate block*).

**(a)** The degree may be awarded to the candidate provided the revision (if any), according to the recommendations by examiners, is completed to the satisfaction of the supervisor.

☐

**(b)** The degree may be awarded to the candidate provided that a substantial revision is completed to the satisfaction of the examiner.

☐

**(c)** The degree should not be awarded to the candidate and the work cannot be re-submitted for examination.

☐

---

#### 4. EXAMINER COMMENTS & SIGNATURE:

The comments of the examiner may be made available to the candidate (*select only one option*):

- ☐ in their entirety  
☐ in part, as indicated in the report  
☐ not at all

EXAMINER:

DATE:

SIGNATURE:

---



## INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMINERS FOR THE EXAMINATION OF A DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

Thank you for accepting the appointment as examiner of a doctoral dissertation from the Faculty of Law, Stellenbosch University. You are one of three examiners on this dissertation and you are required to submit an examiner's report (consisting of **PART A** and **PART B**), as explained further below. You are requested to refrain from communicating with the other examiners, the candidate and the supervisor(s) before submitting the abovementioned report. Any queries you may have should be directed to the non-examining chairperson.

A copy of the Faculty's Postgraduate Guide is available on the Faculty's website (<http://blogs.sun.ac.za/law/>). The guide includes all the examination procedures for a doctoral dissertations, but the important information concerning your role as examiner is included in this letter.

You must please complete **PART A** of the examiner's report, in which a specific recommendation must be made. The recommendation must be one of the following:

- (a) **The degree may be conferred** upon the candidate, provided that the revision (if any), in accordance with the recommendations of the examiners, is completed to the satisfaction of the supervisor.
- (b) **The degree may be conferred** upon the candidate, provided that a material revision is completed to the satisfaction of the examiner(s), as agreed upon by the examination panel.
- (c) **The degree may not be conferred** upon the candidate and the work may not be resubmitted for examination.

**Category (a) should be selected if you are satisfied that the degree can be conferred on the candidate and that the revisions (if any) are minor or of an editorial/typographical nature which you are satisfied can be entrusted to the supervisor's oversight. In this case, the revised dissertation will not be sent back to you,**



UNIVERSITEIT • STELLENBOSCH • UNIVERSITY

jou kennisvennoot • your knowledge partner

FAKULTEIT REGSGELEERDHEID • FACULTY OF LAW

Form H

**but the supervisor will ensure and confirm to the non-examining chairperson that the revisions have been made in line with your recommended revisions.**

**Category (b) should be selected if you are satisfied that the degree can be conferred on the candidate, provided that material revisions are made to the satisfaction of the examiner(s). In this case, the examiner(s) must confirm that they are satisfied with the revisions made by the candidate.**

**Should any of the examiners select category (b), the examiners will have to enter into a discussion at some stage as the material revisions to be completed have to be agreed upon by the examination panel.**

In order for the degree to be awarded to the candidate, the three examiners must unanimously recommend that the degree should be conferred. Should all the examiners agree that the degree may be conferred (that is, any combination of categories (a) and (b), but no one selects (c)), an oral takes place where such unanimous conferment of the degree is confirmed by the examiners and the changes (if any) are required to be made before the degree can be awarded.

Should all the examiners select category (c), i.e. the unanimous recommendation of the examiners is that the degree may not be conferred upon the candidate and that the dissertation may not be resubmitted for examination, the decision is final and no oral or dispute process will follow.

Should one or two examiners select category (c), there is a possible dispute. The examiners' reports and the supervisor(s) report(s) (if any) will be circulated among the examiners and the non-examining chairperson enters into a discussion with the examiners in an attempt to reach consensus on the final outcome. This may further involve an oral to attempt to resolve the possible dispute and that the candidate makes changes. Accordingly, even if you select category (c), you may still be required to participate in an oral and you may suggest revisions which could change your initial view that *the degree should not be conferred* to a view that *the degree may be conferred*. The aim is to reach unanimity regarding the unanimous conferment or non-conferment of the degree among the examiners.



Should unanimity on the result of the examination process still not be reached after such process, a minimum of two external assessors must be appointed. The anonymised reports of the examiners will be made available to the assessors.

The non-examining chairperson will contact you to determine a suitable date and time for the oral (should there be an oral). It is preferred that examiners who are based in the Western Cape travel to Stellenbosch for the oral. However, the oral can take place by of telephonic, Skype, or other interactive-telematic conferencing mediums to accommodate participation in the oral for examiners who are not able to attend the oral in person.

You must also please complete and submit **PART B** of the examiner's report, taking into account the following criteria:

- a) Have the motivation and study objective for the specific research been formulated satisfactorily?
- b) Do the research results constitute a meaningful contribution to the knowledge of and insight in the relevant field of study?
- c) Does the dissertation distinguish clearly between own, new contributions to and known results in the relevant field of study?
- d) Is the candidate capable of evaluating the scientific meaning of his/her results and of placing it in context with existing knowledge in the field of study?
- e) Does the candidate show signs of independent, critical thinking and originality?
- f) Does the candidate show that he/she is sufficiently capable of doing independent research?
- g) Does the dissertation show that the candidate is sufficiently familiar with the relevant research techniques and methods?
- h) Does the dissertation show conversance with and a critical attitude towards related literature?
- i) Is the material presented in a clear, systematic and logical manner?
- j) Is the linguistic, stylistic and technical representation of the dissertation acceptable?
- k) Are the research results acceptable for publication?



Kindly make a clear distinction in PART B of the examiner's report between:

- 1 your comments on the dissertation;
- 2 points of criticism of the dissertation or views adopted in it;
- 3 differences of approach or opinion between yourself and the candidate;
- 4 questions raised or addressed by the dissertation that might be explored further in the oral;
- 5 questions or issues raised by the dissertation that might be taken into consideration in further research or publications by the candidate; and
- 6 points that actually have to be addressed by way of editing or revision of the dissertation in order for it to justify awarding the degree.

Only the last of these points, (6), should be indicated as required revisions, on the basis that the degree cannot be awarded unless the revisions are made. In that case it is essential that you set the required revisions out as clearly and specifically as possible, indicating where the revisions should be made, what they should consist of, and the expected extent of the revisions. As noted above, these revisions are either to be made to the satisfaction of the supervisor (category (a)) or to the satisfaction of the examiner(s) (category (b)).

**PLEASE NOTE** that all the examiners' reports (consisting of PART A and PART B) will be circulated among the examiners once all the reports have been received by the non-examining chairperson. The examiners' reports (consisting of PART A and PART B) will also be made available to the supervisor(s). Anonymised parts of examiners' reports may be made available by the supervisor(s) to the candidate in preparation for the oral and in order to make any of the required revisions or material revisions. Examiners' reports may also be made available to the Research Committee and the Faculty Board.



UNIVERSITEIT • STELLENBOSCH • UNIVERSITY  
jou kennisvennoot • your knowledge partner  
FAKULTEIT REGSGELEERDHEID • FACULTY OF LAW

Form H

**Examiners' reports (Part A and B) should be sent by e-mail to:**

PROF JACQUES DU PLESSIS

THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

FACULTY OF LAW, STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY

E-mail address: jedp@sun.ac.za

Contact number: +27 21 808 3189

**Please send us your signed report in PDF format. In order to facilitate anonymised parts of the examiners' reports being made available to the candidate (if necessary), please ensure that Part B of your report is typed (and not handwritten) and also sent to us in MS Word format.**





**INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMINERS FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF A DOCTORAL DISSERTATION**

N.B.: Reports of the examiners will be treated as confidential and only technical details will be conveyed to the candidate.

The examination for the doctorate in Medicine consists of:

- (a) an evaluation by (one) internal and (two) external examiners of the dissertation submitted on a subject researched by the candidate;
  - (b) an oral examination.
- I. Each examiner must submit an independent; written assessment of the dissertation drafted in terms of the general criteria as specified in (a) below. ***The report should be directed to:***

Manager: Doctoral Office  
(Tygerberg Campus)  
Faculty of Medicine and Health  
Sciences  
P.O. Box 241  
**CAPE TOWN 8000, REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA**

- (a) The report should be compiled keeping the following in mind:
  - (i) the title;
  - (ii) name and affiliation of the examiner;
  - (iii) literature review;
  - (iv) formulation of the aims of the investigation and whether there has been sufficient demarcation of the research field and conceptualisation of the research topic;
  - (v) sufficient mastery of the appropriate research methodology and problem solving;
  - (vi) clear, systematic and logical presentation of the material;
  - (vii) proper documentation and substantiation of the research results;
  - (viii) aspects that were questioned and suggestions that were put forward;
  - (ix) whether the dissertation makes an original contribution to the established body of knowledge on the particular subject;
  - (x) the independent, critical judgement of the candidate;
  - (xi) whether the changes were brought about to the satisfaction of the examiners;
  - (xii) acceptable presentation in terms of grammar and style;
  - (xiii) recommendations.

2. **In addition to the examiner's written report, a standard report (herewith) should also be submitted, reflecting the examiner's final assessment.**

## **1. DISSERTATION REQUIREMENTS**

Three versions of PhD dissertation submission for the FMHS will be allowed:

- Conventional format dissertation
- Publication format dissertation, and
- Hybrid format dissertation

The focus and quality of the research and of the reporting remain the most important aspects in all formats and these formats are treated equally.

The differences between the three formats are as follows:

### **Conventional dissertation:**

An introduction chapter, followed by a number of chapters outlining the research, followed by a discussion chapter of the research results of the whole dissertation, highlighting the scientific contributions of the study, followed by a conclusion and future directions.

### **Publication format dissertation:**

An introduction chapter, followed by a minimum of 4 first-authored peer-reviewed published/accepted for publication articles (a maximum of 2 of which may be published within 5 years prior to registration), followed by a discussion chapter of the research results of the whole dissertation, highlighting the scientific contributions of the study, followed by a conclusion and future directions. It is also acceptable to have a separate chapter on methodology; however, it should be clarified whether or not this chapter represents a publication on its own (e.g. a protocol paper).

### **Hybrid format dissertation:**

An introduction chapter, followed by a minimum of 2 first-authored peer-reviewed published/accepted for publication articles (one or both of which may be published within 5 years prior to registration), AND EITHER

- *a minimum of 2 first-authored submission-ready/submitted manuscripts* (a submission-ready manuscript is a manuscript that is already in the final format required for submission by the chosen journal) OR
- a minimum of 2 chapters outlining the research OR
- a combination (minimum of 2) of first-authored submission-ready/submitted manuscripts and chapters outlining the research, followed by a discussion chapter of the research results of the whole dissertation, highlighting the scientific contributions of the study, followed by a conclusion and future directions. It is also acceptable to have a separate chapter on methodology; however, it should be clarified whether or not this chapter represents a publication on its own (e.g. a protocol paper).

The information above is summarized in the table below:

<b>Publication</b>	Introduction	At least 4 x first-authored peer-reviewed published/accepted for publication articles		Discussion	Conclusion
<b>Conventional</b>	Introduction	Chapters		Discussion	Conclusion
<b>Hybrid 1</b>	Introduction	At least 2 x first-authored peer-reviewed published/accepted for publication articles	At least 2 x first-authored submission-ready/submitted manuscripts	Discussion	Conclusion
<b>Hybrid 2</b>	Introduction	At least 2 x first-authored peer-reviewed published/accepted for publication articles	At least 2 x chapters	Discussion	Conclusion
<b>Hybrid 3</b>	Introduction	At least 2 x first-authored peer-reviewed published/accepted for publication articles	Combination (minimum 2) of first-authored submission-ready/submitted manuscripts and chapters	Discussion	Conclusion

If only one manuscript has been published at the time of submission for examination, the conventional format dissertation must be followed and the manuscript reformatted into a chapter. The published manuscript may be included in the appendices but not in the main body of the dissertation.

- For both published/accepted articles and submission-ready/submitted manuscripts under review, information on the journal's URL, impact factor and any other information that will help examiners evaluate the quality of your work must be included.
- Articles with co-first authorship are allowed for submission towards the minimum number of first author articles (namely four), with the proviso that the final published article must clearly indicate on the title page that the two first authors have contributed equally to the publication. As the term "co-first authorship" means that both authors contributed equally to the relevant publication, the declaration in the front matter of the dissertation should state clearly what each author contributed to the article. The contribution of each first author should therefore be equal, and clearly outlined in the declaration, and authors who share the first authorship must clearly demonstrate why co-first authorship was necessary.

## GLOSSARY

<b>Introduction</b>	This is the chapter that introduces the topic and the problem, covers relevant literature in order to justify the topic, and highlights research gaps.
<b>First authored</b>	A first-authored manuscript is a manuscript where the PhD candidate is the first named author in a list of authors and, as such, the lead author on the manuscript.

<b>Peer-review</b>	This refers to a process whereby a manuscript submitted to a journal is vetted for quality and importance by reviewers, who are scholars or researchers in the subject area in question, according to the editorial standards of that journal, before it is accepted for publication. This is intended to be a rigorous process that ensures that a manuscript that is published in a journal is a sound piece of research/scholarship.
<b>Published</b>	This is a manuscript that is available in print or on-line. This includes an advance online publication (a manuscript that is available before it becomes available in a specific issue of the print or online journal). An advance online publication may or may not have been edited at the time that it goes online and may or may not have a DOI (digital object identifier) assigned yet.
<b>Accepted for publication</b>	This is a manuscript that is accepted by a journal to be published and which typically includes author-incorporated changes suggested during submission, peer review, and editor-author communications. It is not the version that includes the publisher's contributions, such as copy-editing and formatting.
<b>Submission-ready</b>	This refers to a manuscript that is in a ready state to submit to a journal. A ready state means that further edits/changes/improvements are not envisioned. This does not refer to a manuscript that is not yet finished or in preparation.
<b>Submitted manuscript</b>	This refers to a manuscript that has been submitted to a journal and is either awaiting editorial or reviewer assignment or is under peer-review.
<b>Discussion</b>	The purpose of the discussion chapter is to interpret the meaning of the results within the context of what is known about the topic. New insights based on the findings should be explained. The discussion will consist of argumentation as different perspectives and explanations are considered. This chapter could include limitations and recommendations for future research
<b>Conclusion and future directions</b>	The conclusion and future directions chapter ties together, integrates, and synthesizes various issues raised in the discussion, while at the same time reflects on the aims and objectives. The conclusion should provide answers to the research question(s), identify theoretical and/or clinical and/or policy implications of the work, highlight the limitations and strengths, and recommend areas for future research.



---

**INSTRUKSIES AAN EKSAMINATORE VIR DIE EVALUERING VAN 'N DOKTORALE PROEFSKRIF**  
**INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMINERS FOR THE EVALUATION OF A DOCTORAL DISSERTATION**

NOTA AAN EKSAMINATORE: Na voltooiing van die vorm en verslag, moet dit aan die Dekaan: Fakulteit Krygskunde gestuur word vóór of op die sperdatum. Eksterne eksaminatore kan enige een van die volgende drie opsies gebruik: (i) **pos-** of **koerier**versending van die oorspronklike, ondertekende vorm en verslag; **OF** (ii) **faks**versending van die oorspronklike, ondertekende vorm en verslag; **OF** (iii) **e-pos**versending van die oorspronklike vorm en verslag, verkieslik in 'n pdf-formaat.

NOTE TO EXAMINERS: After completing the form and report, it must be send to the Dean: Faculty of Military Science on or before the specified deadline. External examiners may use any one of the following three options: (i) **postal** or **courier** services to send the original, signed form and report; **OR** (ii) **fax** the original, signed form and report; **OR** (iii) **e-mail** the original form and report, preferably in pdf format.

---

**INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMINERS FOR THE EVALUATION OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS**

NB. The reports of the examiners are dealt with confidentially and only technical details are generally shared with the candidate. However, if the examiner agrees to it on the form, relevant parts of the report may be disclosed to the candidate without mention of the examiner's name.

The written report and form (which should be addressed to The Dean: Faculty of Military Science) should preferably be send back via **e-mail** ([basson71@sun.ac.za](mailto:basson71@sun.ac.za)) or **faxed** (+27 22 702 3050 or 086 416 8505).

Each examiner should compile an independent evaluation in the form of a written **report** in accordance with the general criteria as specified below. You are requested to compile the report as **completely** as possible (approximately 3-5 pages) so that the examination panel can distinguish the arguments on which your praise/criticism are based. The quality of the examination is entirely dependent on the quality of the examination reports. In this we request your cooperation.

The report needs to be compiled in accordance with the following criteria:

- (a) sufficient delimitation and conceptualisation of the research field and topic;
- (b) command of the relevant research method and familiarity with the relevant literature;
- (c) clear, systematic and logical presentation of the material;
- (d) proper documentation and verification of the research results;
- (e) acceptable linguistic and stylistic editing; and
- (f) whether the dissertation makes a contribution to the knowledge in the relevant subject.

In addition to the written report, each examiner also has to complete the attached standard report form in which a pertinent recommendation has to be made, and that must accompany the report.

---

---

---



NOTA AAN STUDIELEIER: Voltooi asb. Afdeling 2 op vorm voordat dit na eksaminatore versend word.  
NOTE TO SUPERVISOR: Please complete Section 2 on the form before sending it to the examiners.

**(A) EKSAMINATORSVERSLAGVORM**  
**(A) EXAMINER'S REPORT FORM**

**1. EKSAMINATOR / EXAMINER**

Titel, Voorletter(s) en Van <i>Title, Initial(s) and Surname</i>			
Fisiese Adres <i>Physical Address</i>			
Tel. nr. / Tel. no.		E-pos / E-mail	
Betrokkenheid by proefskrif <i>Involvement with dissertation</i>	Promotor <i>Supervisor</i>	Mede-promotor <i>Co-supervisor</i>	Eksaminator <i>Examiner</i>

**2. STUDENT (KANDIDAAT) / STUDENT (CANDIDATE)**

Titel, voorletter(s) en van <i>Title, initial(s) and surname</i>			
Degree <i>Degree</i>	PhD	Vakrigting <i>Main field of study</i>	
Titel van tesis <i>Title of thesis</i>			

**3. AANBEVELING / RECOMMENDATION**

NOTA AAN EKSAMINATOR: Merk EEN van die volgende opsies gemerk a – e.  
NOTE TO EXAMINER: Mark ONE of the following options a – e.

(No mark has to be allocated):

I have examined the candidate's dissertation and recommend:

A	<b>AWARD</b> – This dissertation does not require any amendments and should be classified as passed. Minor errors or omissions of an editorial nature may exist and may be corrected by the candidate. If left uncorrected, these errors do not alter the recommendation that the thesis will be classified as passed.	
B	<b>MINOR CORRECTIONS REQUIRED</b> – This dissertation requires the correction of presentation errors (such as editorial, formatting and typographical mistakes) and minor deficiencies (such as missing words, additional reference and clearer explanations) as detailed in my examiner's report. The errors identified do not affect the quality of the outcomes of the research undertaken and must be done to the satisfaction of the supervisor(s).	
C	<b>MAJOR CORRECTIONS REQUIRED</b> – This dissertation requires a number of important corrections as detailed in my examiner's report. (Areas identified for major correction may relate to further explanation or justification of hypothesis, inclusion of additional data, revised literature review, clarification of results, expansion of discussion, substantial textual changes to improve the clarity of argument, removal of significant amount of unnecessary or erroneous information). The corrections will not alter the research outcomes but will improve the quality of the thesis and the way in which the research has been represented.  I recommend that the thesis/dissertation be passed conditionally subject to specific major corrections being made to the satisfaction of the supervisor(s).	

D	<b>REVISE AND RESUBMIT FOR FURTHER EXAMINATION BY THE ORIGINAL EXAMINERS</b> – The candidate is required to carry out further work and make substantive revisions, corrections and amendments to this dissertation. The revised thesis is to be re-examined by the original examiners. The further work may include new experiments or data collection, additional analysis, revision of scientific method or any essential work that may alter the conclusions drawn in the thesis/dissertation. My examiner's report details the major shortcomings which the revised thesis should address. (Please do not identify yourself on the detailed report).	
E	<b>FAIL</b> – The dissertation be classified as failed, without the right to re-submit the thesis, on the basis that a significant amount of additional research work and/or major, substantive revision will not raise the dissertation to an acceptable standard.	

If Option B, C or D above was selected, do you give permission that relevant sections from your report (without mention of your name) may be made available to the candidate in order to facilitate the process of finishing the manuscript? (Please circle your answer.) **YES / NO**

Handtekening Signature		Datum / Date	

---

NOTA AAN EKSAMINATOR: Voltooi verslag; ongeveer 3-5 bladsye  
*NOTE TO EXAMINER: Complete report; approximately 3-5 pages*

**(B) EVALUERINGSVERSLAG OOR TESIS**  
**(B) ASSESSMENT REPORT ON THESIS**

---

**Eksaminator / Examiner:**

**Student / Student:**

**Proefskriftitel /  
Dissertation title:**

**Verslag / Report**

<b>Handtekening</b> van eksaminator <i>Signature of examiner</i>		<b>Datum / Date</b>	
---	--	---------------------	--





## INSTRUKSIES AAN EKSAMINATORE VIR DIE BEOORDELING VAN 'N DOKTORALE PROEFSKRIF INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMINERS FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF A DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

**NOTA AAN EKSAMINATORE:** Stuur asseblief die voltooide vorm en verslag aan die Dekaan: Fakulteit Natuurwetenskappe vóór of op die sperdatum. Eksterne eksaminatore kan enige een van die volgende twee opsies gebruik: (i) **pos-** of **koerier**versending van die oorspronklike, ondertekende vorm en verslag; OF (ii) **e-pos**versending van die oorspronklike vorm en verslag, verkieslik in 'n pdf-formaat.

**NOTE TO EXAMINERS:** Please send the completed form and report to the Dean: Faculty of Science no later than the specified deadline. External examiners may use any one of the following options: (i) send the original, signed form and report **via postal** or **courier** services; (ii) send the original form and report **via e-mail**, preferably in pdf format.

*Die verslae van die eksaminatore word vertroulik hanteer en slegs tegniese besonderhede word aan die kandidaat meegedeel.*

*The reports of the external examiners will be treated as confidential and only technical details will be conveyed to the candidate.*

1. EKSAMINATORE moet asb. die **eksaminators-verslagvorm (A)** voltooi waarin 'n pertinente aanbeveling gemaak word.
2. EKSAMINATORE moet ook 'n **evalueringsverslag oor die proefskrif (B)** (ongeveer 2 bladsye) opstel, met inagneming van onder andere die volgende kriteria:
  - Word daar 'n bevredigende formulering verskaf van die motivering vir die doelwitte van die bepaalde navorsing?
  - Maak die navorsingsresultate 'n betekenisvolle bydrae tot die kennis van en insig in die betrokke gebied?
  - Tref die proefskrif 'n duidelike onderskeid tussen eie, nuwe bydraes, en bekende resultate op die betrokke gebied?
  - Is die kandidaat in staat om die wetenskaplike betekenis van sy / haar resultate te evalueer en in konteks met die kennis in die veld van navorsing te plaas?
  - Gee die kandidaat blyke van onafhanklike, kritiese denke of ander aanduidings van oorspronklikheid?
  - Lewer die kandidaat genoegsame blyke dat hy / sy in staat is om selfstandige navorsing te onderneem?
  - Toon die proefskrif voldoende kennis en beheersing van die tersaaklike navorsingstegnieke en -metodiek?
  - Openbaar die proefskrif vertroudheid met, en kritiese ingesteldheid teenoor die relevante literatuur?
  - Word die materiaal duidelik, sistematies en logies aangebied?
  - Is die taalkundige, stilistiese en tegniese versorging van die proefskrif aanvaarbaar?
  - Is die navorsingsresultate geskik vir publikasie?

1. EXAMINERS must please complete the **examiner's report form (A)**, in which a specific recommendation must be made

2. EXAMINERS must also submit an **assessment report on the dissertation (B)** (approximately 2 pages), taking into account the following criteria:

- Has the motivation for the objectives of the study been formulated satisfactorily?
- Do the research results constitute a meaningful contribution to the knowledge of and insight into the relevant field of study?
- Does the dissertation distinguish clearly between own, new contributions to, and known results in the relevant field of study?
- Is the candidate capable of evaluating the scientific meaning of his / her results and of placing this in context within existing knowledge in the field of study?
- Does the candidate show signs of independent, critical thinking or other signs of originality?
- Does the candidate show that he / she is sufficiently capable of doing independent research?
- Does the dissertation show that the candidate is sufficiently familiar with the relevant research techniques and methods?
- Does dissertation show conversance with, and a critical attitude towards the pertinent literature?
- Is the material presented in a clear, systematic and logical manner?
- Is the linguistic, stylistic and technical editing of the dissertation acceptable?
- Are the research results acceptable for publication?

**Vorm (A), verslag (B) en vrae (C) moet gestuur word aan:**

Dekaan: Fakulteit Natuurwetenskappe  
 Peroldgebou, Merrimanlaan  
 Universiteit van Stellenbosch  
 7600 Stellenbosch  
 Suid-Afrika  
 E-pos: [se@sun.ac.za](mailto:se@sun.ac.za)

**Sperdatum vir ontvangs van bogenoemde:**  
 [Klik [hier](#) en tik departementele sperdatum]

**Form (A), report (B) and questions (C) should be sent to:**

Dean: Faculty of Science  
 Perold Building, Merriman Avenue,  
 Stellenbosch University  
 7600 Stellenbosch  
 South Africa  
 E-mail: [se@sun.ac.za](mailto:se@sun.ac.za)

**Deadline for receipt of the above:**  
 [Click [here](#) and type departmental deadline]



**NOTA AAN PROMOTOR:** Gebruik hierdie vorm om vir elke eksaminator 'n aparte elektroniese vorm voor te berei. Voltooi asb afdelings 1 en 2 op die vorm voordat dit, saam met die proefskrif, aan die eksaminatore versend word.

**NOTE TO SUPERVISOR:** Use this form to create a separate electronic form for each examiner. Please complete sections 1 and 2 on the form before sending the form, together with the dissertation, to the examiners.

## (A) EKSAMINATORSVERSLAGVORM (DOKTORALE PROEFSKRIF)

### (A) EXAMINER'S REPORT FORM (DOCTORAL DISSERTATION)

#### 1. EKSAMINATOR / EXAMINER

<b>Titel, voorletter(s) en van</b> <i>Title, initial(s) and surname</i>			
<b>Adres</b> <i>Address</i>			
<b>Tel.</b>		<b>E-pos / E-mail</b>	
<b>Betrokkenheid by proefskrif</b> <i>Involvement with dissertation</i>	<b>Promotor</b> <i>Supervisor</i>	<b>Medepromotor</b> <i>Co-supervisor</i>	<b>Eksaminator</b> <i>Examiner</i>

#### 2. STUDENT (KANDIDAAT) / STUDENT (CANDIDATE)

<b>Titel, voorletter(s) en van</b> <i>Title, initial(s) and surname</i>			
<b>Degree</b> <i>Degree</i>		<b>Vakrigting</b> <i>Main field of study</i>	
<b>Titel van proefskrif</b> <i>Title of dissertation</i>			

#### 3. AANBEVELING / RECOMMENDATION

**NOTA AAN EKSAMINATOR:** Merk EEN van die volgende opsies gemerk a – e.

**NOTE TO EXAMINER:** Mark ONE of the following options a – e.

Ek het bogemelde kandidaat se doktorsale proefskrif geëksamineer en beveel aan dat:

*I have examined the candidate's dissertation and recommend that:*

- ☐ (a) Die graad aan die kandidaat toegeken word.  
*The degree be awarded to the candidate.*
- ☐ (b) Mits feitelike of redaksionele wysigings tot tevredenheid van die promotor aangebring word, die graad aan die kandidaat toegeken word.  
*Provided certain factual or editorial changes are made to the satisfaction of the supervisor, the degree be awarded to the candidate.*
- ☐ (c) Mits feitelike of redaksionele wysigings tot tevredenheid van die eksaminator aangebring word, die graad aan die kandidaat toegeken word. NEEM KENNIS: Die eksaminator moet die promotor, sowel as die eksamenkantoor skriftelik per e-pos in kennis stel dat die wysigings tot tevredenheid van hom / haar aangebring is.  
*Provided factual or editorial corrections are made to the satisfaction of the examiner, the degree be awarded to the candidate. NOTE: Written confirmation by the examiner that the corrections have been made to his / her satisfaction must be sent by e-mail to both the supervisor and the examination office.*
- ☐ (d) Die kandidaat die geleentheid gegee word om die proefskrif te hersien en weer voor te lê.  
*The candidate be given an opportunity to revise and resubmit the dissertation.*
- ☐ (e) Die graad **nie** verleen word nie.  
*The degree not be awarded.*

<b>Handtekening</b> <i>Signature</i>		<b>Datum / Date</b>	
---	--	---------------------	--

**NOTA AAN EKSAMINATORE:** Voltooi verslag; ongeveer 2 bladsye

**NOTE TO EXAMINERS:** Complete report; approximately 2 pages

**(B) EVALUERINGSVERSLAG OOR PROEFSKRIF**  
**(B) ASSESSMENT REPORT ON DISSERTATION**

**Eksaminator/**  
**Examiner:**

**Student/**  
**Student:**

**Proefskriftitel/**  
**Dissertation title:**

**Verslag/**  
**Report:**

**(C) VOORGESTELDE VRAE OOR DIE PROEFSKRIF**  
**(C) PROPOSED QUESTIONS ON THE DISSERTATION**

Indien u nie die finale mondelinge eksamen van bogenoemde kandidaat kan bywoon nie, heg asseblief vrae aan wat gedurende die eksamen aan die kandidaat gestel kan word.

*If you cannot attend the final oral examination of abovementioned candidate, please attach questions that can be posed to the candidate during the examination.*

<b>Handtekening van eksaminator</b> <b>Signature of examiner</b>		<b>Datum / Date</b>	
---	--	---------------------	--

# Faculty of Theology

## Guidelines for examiners of PhD dissertations

### INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMINERS FOR THE EVALUATION OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

NB. The reports of the examiners are dealt with confidentially and only technical details are generally shared with the candidate. However, if the examiner agrees to it on the form, relevant parts of the report may be disclosed to the candidate without mention of the name of the examiner.

The doctoral dissertation defence will take place on **DAY DATE MONTH YEAR** at \_\_h\_\_ (**SA time**). Your report should please be returned to the Faculty at the LATEST by **DAY DATE MONTH YEAR, \_\_h\_\_** to allow sufficient time for the copying of the report and the preparation to be done by the members of the panel. The written report (which should be addressed to The Dean: Theology) and form should preferably be sent back by e-mail (to [mariekeb@sun.ac.za](mailto:mariekeb@sun.ac.za)) or [brobyn@sun.ac.za](mailto:brobyn@sun.ac.za) ).

The reports of the external examiners will be considered during the defence, in which it is required that at least one of the external examiners participates (personally or telephonically). Arrangements will be made with you in this regard.

Each examiner should compile an independent evaluation in the form of a written report in accordance with the general criteria as specified below. You are urgently requested to compile the report as **completely** as possible (with a guideline between three and five pages) so that the examination panel can distinguish the arguments on which your praise/criticism is based. The quality of the examination is entirely dependent on the quality of the examination reports. In this we request your cooperation.

The report needs to be compiled with due allowance for the following criteria:

- (a) sufficient delimitation and conceptualisation of the research field and topic;
- (b) command of the relevant research method and familiarity with the relevant literature;
- (c) clear, systematic and logical presentation of the material;
- (d) proper documentation and verification of the research results;
- (e) acceptable linguistic and stylistic editing;
- (f) whether the dissertation makes a contribution to the knowledge in the relevant subject.

In addition to the written report, each examiner also has to complete the attached standard report form, in which a pertinent recommendation has to be made, and send it back with the report.



UNIVERSITEIT • STELLENBOSCH • UNIVERSITY  
jou kennisvenoot • your knowledge partner

**FACULTY OF THEOLOGY**  
**REPORT FORM FOR EXAMINERS OF A DOCTORAL DISSERTATION**

1. **TO:** The Dean: Theology  
Stellenbosch University  
Private Bag X1  
7602 MATIELAND

**FROM:** Prof./Dr/Mr/Mrs/Miss

-----  
(Please print)  
**ADDRESS:** -----

-----  
**TEL:** ----- **E-MAIL:** -----

2. **CANDIDATE:** -----  
(Title) (Initials) (Surname)

3. **DEGREE:** ----- (-----)  
(Field of study)

4. **TITLE OF DISSERTATION:** -----  
-----

5. **RECOMMENDATION** (Tick only one of the blocks – PLEASE NOTE: **No mark has to be allocated**):

I have examined the candidate's dissertation and recommend:

A	<b>AWARD</b> – This thesis/dissertation does not require any amendments and should be classified as passed. Minor errors or omissions of an editorial nature may exist and may be corrected by the candidate. If left uncorrected these errors do not alter the recommendation that the thesis will be classified as passed.	
B	<b>MINOR CORRECTIONS REQUIRED</b> – This thesis/dissertation requires the correction of errors of presentation (such as editorial, formatting and typographical mistakes) and minor deficiencies (such as missing words, additional reference and clearer explanations) as detailed in my examiner's report. The errors identified do not affect the quality of the outcomes of the research undertaken and must be done to the satisfaction of the supervisor(s).	
C	<b>MAJOR CORRECTIONS REQUIRED</b> – This thesis/dissertation requires a number of important corrections as detailed in my examiner's report. (Areas identified for major correction may relate to further explanation or justification of hypothesis, inclusion of additional data, revised literature review, clarification of results, expansion of discussion, substantial textual changes to improve the clarity of argument, removal of significant amount of unnecessary or erroneous information). The corrections will not alter the research outcomes but will improve the quality of the thesis and the way in which the research has been represented. I recommend that the thesis/dissertation be passed conditionally subject to specific major corrections being made to the satisfaction of the supervisor(s).	
D	<b>REVISE AND RESUBMIT FOR FURTHER EXAMINATION BY THE ORIGINAL EXAMINERS</b> – The candidate is required to carry out further work and make substantive revisions and corrections amendments to this thesis/dissertation. The	

	revised thesis is to be re-examined by the original examiners. The further work may include new experiments or data collection, additional analysis, revision of scientific method or any essential work that may alter the conclusions drawn in the thesis/dissertation. My examiner's report details the major shortcomings which the revised thesis should address. Please do not identify yourself on the detailed report.	
E	<b>FAIL –</b> The thesis/dissertation be classified as failed, without right to resubmit the thesis, on the basis that a significant amount of additional research work and/or major, substantive revision will not raise the thesis/dissertation to an acceptable standard.	

If Option B, C or D above was selected, do you give permission that relevant sections from your report (without mention of your name) may be made available to the candidate in order to facilitate the process of finishing the manuscript? (Please circle your answer.) YES / NO

SIGNATURE: -----

DATE: -----