

Follow up Thesis/Plagiarism case 5.1.2e

Thesis resubmission 5.1.2e noon – oral defense Friday 5.1.2e

Student: 5.1.2e

On behalf of the program: 5.1.2e
5.1.2e (Thesis Coordinator)

We received the resubmission of the retake of the thesis by the agreed deadline, 5.1.2e noon.

We asked the supervisor to verify that the contents of the resubmission, after the double revision (to resolve the many issues of attribution), still coherently match the agreed and discussed research. This was confirmed by the supervisor (5.1.2e 5.1.2e) via email:

"I took a very quick look. I think the thesis still contains all the key parts we initially agreed on (and are key to a satisfactory work product). I wasn't able to read the entire thesis again, so I cannot comment on the quality of argumentation and the writing style, but I think the key research questions have been addressed (more or less at least). Given the events that have taken place since 5.1.2e however, I do not think 5.2.1

In the oral defense of the second retake, we asked questions to verify the following:

- The work in the thesis is the product of the thought process and the articulation of the thoughts by the student (by asking questions about substance)
- The demonstrated understanding by the student of the academic standards of proper attribution (given that a number of issues remain in the second resubmission in which 5.1.2e was explicitly requested to repair them)

In order to verify, we proceeded as follows:

- We looked at the changes between the first and second resubmissions (via 5.1.2e), to assess where the student had worked on the attribution issues
- We allowed the student to, at 5.1.2e own proposal, give a short oral presentation of 5.1.2e thesis research (max. 10 minutes, no slides)
- The thesis coordinator asked substantive questions to verify that the student masters the subject matter 5.1.2e wrote about
- 5.1.2e asked questions about the revision process the student applied for the two resubmissions

Given the nature of the concerns, for part of the answers the student was explicitly asked to respond without the computer (and thesis) open.

Presentation:

Discusses [redacted] 5.1.2e does not articulate research topic from the top of [redacted] 5.1.2e head.

Has to read out loud what the research question is. Even reads out the methodology.
“this issue” without articulating

[redacted] 5.1.2e

[Does not articulate overall storyline. No conclusion. Outside of time limit.]

Questions asked:

[redacted] 5.1.2e

[redacted] 5.1.2e

Answers more on the substantive level than on the methodological question.

[redacted] 5.1.2e

[redacted] 5.1.2e

[redacted] 5.1.2e

[redacted] 5.1.2e

Does not know the article

[redacted] 5.1.2e

[redacted] 5.1.2e: did you look at [redacted] 5.1.2e

Answer: yes, I mention it. [redacted] 5.1.2e is discussed in the thesis.

[redacted] 5.1.2e: About the revision process. How did you go about revising the thesis after the feedback.

Answer: focus on citation and attribution. Cites lack of initial understanding. Referred back to [redacted] 5.1.2e

[redacted] 5.1.2e: How did you actually carry out the revision, e.g. after having been handed the Turnitin report?

Answer: shows understanding of differences between highlight and flag.

[redacted] 5.1.2e: do you think that ideas can be plagiarized? Because in the instructions given prior you were asked to create your own arguments.

Answer: reports having tried to give [redacted] 5.1.2e own opinion. In the revision did not want to fully restructure the thesis. Not enough time.

[redacted] 5.1.2e: to follow up on expression your opinion –

[redacted] 5.1.2e

[redacted] 5.1.2e

[redacted] 5.1.2e

[redacted] ?

Answer: [redacted] 5.1.2e.

[redacted] 5.1.2e what has been your prior research and thesis writing experience.

Answer: 5.1.2e Providing references to sources. 5.1.2e
5.1.2e

Decision:

After deliberation with the committee, we informed the student that the result of the oral defense was that 5.1.2e resubmission was not passable:

- Proper rewrite did not happen
- Oral presentation did not convince mastery of substance
- Answering questions during oral defense did not demonstrate mastery of the substance
- Extra time (second retake) was not used to address the issues in a significant manner and to demonstrate understanding of substance and standards.

Follow up: Given this decision, the student was given into consideration two options

1. to reregister to complete the thesis process (which -subject to agreement by the exam board on how to proceed- could involve writing a new thesis under a new supervisor),
2. or to leave the program with the certificates for all the completed courses.

The student indicated that 5.1.2e prefers the first option to reregister, and acknowledges that 5.1.2e understand completing the program may involve writing a new thesis under new supervision. The program board instructed and assisted 5.1.2e to file the reregistration before the deadline (end of the month).

Leiden, 5.1.2e

5.1.2e

5.1.2e