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Welcome to the Department of Philosophy at the University of Johannesburg! You are part of the most dynamic and ambitious philosophy department in the Global South, and of a research community that is having a significant impact on the international philosophical landscape.

We, the permanent academic staff of the Department, hope that you will find your time here stimulating and challenging. We encourage you to participate actively and as fully as you can in the intellectual life of the Department, and to take advantage of the exceptional opportunities available to you.

As a postgraduate student in this Department, you have access to resources that rival those available in the top universities globally. Chief among these are the brains of your supervisor, lecturer, and peers in the postgraduate community. Take advantage of the resources available to you: come to talks, reading groups, seminars, and other events; ask for feedback on your work; read the work of other members of the Department both junior and senior; and share your work at conferences.

This handbook contains administrative information, as well as advice and guidance. Take the time to read it. You will find it useful.

We look forward to working with you in the coming year, and wish you success and fulfilment in your studies!

The Philosophy Team
## I. Administrative Information

### 1. Postgraduate Timetable 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Honours</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 January</td>
<td>Submit research essay to Faculty, if don't want to register for 2019</td>
<td>Submit thesis/ dissertation to Faculty, if don't want to register for 2019</td>
<td>Submit thesis to Faculty, if don't want to register for 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 January–1 February</td>
<td>Faculty Tutor Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 February</td>
<td><strong>Postgraduate Induction Lunch</strong>: all new PGs to attend (12:30 – 15:00, Pathways Guesthouse, Melville)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 February</td>
<td><strong>DEADLINE FOR POSTGRADUATE REGISTRATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 February</td>
<td>Film Screening: Prof Richard Shusterman “Philosophy as a Way of Life – On Camera” 9:30-11:00. Chinua Achebe auditorium, APK Library Compulsory Attendance by Honours and MA (Coursework) students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 February</td>
<td>Deadline for selecting supervisor (and co-supervisor/s where applicable). Email to PG co-ordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 February</td>
<td>Departmental Colloquium: Speaker TBA 11:20-12:50. Venue Andre P Brink Room, APK Library, 2nd floor Compulsory attendance by all PGs, apologies to the PG co-ordinator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 March</td>
<td>CB (Module 9) Minor assignment</td>
<td>CB (Module 9) Minor assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 March</td>
<td>Departmental Colloquium: Dr Lubomira Radoilska 11:20-12:50. Venue Andre P Brink Room, APK Library, 2nd floor Compulsory attendance by all PGs, apologies to the PG co-ordinator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 March</td>
<td>Departmental Colloquium: Mr Phila Msimang 11:20-12:50. Venue Andre P Brink Room, APK Library, 2nd floor Compulsory attendance by all PGs, apologies to the PG co-ordinator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 March</td>
<td><strong>END OF TERM 1 (MID-SEMESTER VACATION – 21 MARCH – 31 MARCH)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 April</td>
<td><strong>START OF TERM 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 April</td>
<td>CB (Module 9) Exam Essay due</td>
<td>CB (Module 9) Exam Essay due</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Honours</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 April</td>
<td>1st year coursework: If not doing Module 24 with Prof Lotter, submit proposal for research essay to supervisor</td>
<td>2nd year coursework: submit proposal for minor dissertation to supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 April</td>
<td>HPPL Module 1 Research Essay:</td>
<td>HPPL Module 1 Research Essay:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hand in 3,000 word research proposals</td>
<td>Hand in 3,000 word research proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 April</td>
<td>Departmental Colloquium: Prof Alex Broadbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:20-12:50 Venue TBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All PGs to attend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 April</td>
<td>Departmental Colloquium: Dr Sherif Salem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:20-12:50 Venue TBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All PGs to attend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 April</td>
<td>Coursework 1st and 2nd year: Email proposals to PG coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 April</td>
<td>Coursework 1st and 2nd year:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defend proposals to departmental HDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Honours</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 May</td>
<td>AS (Module 4) Minor assignment</td>
<td>AS (Module 4) Minor assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 May</td>
<td>Departmental Colloquium: Mr Kyle Hammet Blumberg</td>
<td>Departmental Colloquium: Mr Kyle Hammet Blumberg</td>
<td>Departmental Colloquium: Mr Kyle Hammet Blumberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All PGs to attend.</td>
<td>All PGs to attend.</td>
<td>All PGs to attend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 May</td>
<td>MA (thesis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submit research proposals to PG co-ordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 May</td>
<td>END OF TERM 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 May</td>
<td>Study Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 May</td>
<td>MA (thesis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present research proposals to Departmental HDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 May</td>
<td>AS (Module 4) Exam assignment due</td>
<td>AS (Module 4) Exam assignment due</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>HONOURS</td>
<td>MASTER’S</td>
<td>DOCTORATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MA (thesis)</strong> Deadline for 1st semester full thesis-submissions</td>
<td>Deadline for 1st semester thesis-submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 June</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MA (thesis)</strong> Submit research proposals to Faculty for HDC approval at 13 June HDC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 June</td>
<td><strong>HPPL Module 1 Research Essay:</strong> Hand in 6,000 word draft of research essay to supervisor</td>
<td><strong>HPPL Module 24 Research Essay:</strong> Hand in 6,000 word draft of research essay to supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 June – 7 July</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WINTER HOLIDAYS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 19 July</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Research Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 July</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>START OF TERM 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 July</td>
<td><strong>HPPL Module 1 Research Essay:</strong> Hand in 10,000 word draft of research essay</td>
<td><strong>HPPL Module 24 Research Essay:</strong> Hand in 10,000 word draft of research essay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 August</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual progress review – all MA</td>
<td>Annual progress review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 August</td>
<td><strong>Departmental Colloquium: Prof Vasti Roodt</strong> 11:20-12:50.Venue TBA: all PGs to attend. Apologies to PG Co-ordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 August</td>
<td><strong>Departmental Colloquium: Speaker TBA</strong> 11:20-12:50.Venue TBA: all PGs to attend. Apologies to PG Co-ordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 August</td>
<td><strong>VM (Module 8)</strong> Minor assignment</td>
<td><strong>VM (Module 8)</strong> Minor assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 September</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>END OF TERM 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-29 September</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MID-SEMESTER BREAK</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Honours</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16 September</strong></td>
<td><strong>START OF TERM 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17 September</strong></td>
<td>VM (Module 8) Exam</td>
<td>VM (Module 8) Exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25 September</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit research proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to PG Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18 September</strong></td>
<td>Departmental Colloquium: Speaker TBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:20-12:50. Venue TBA: all PGs to attend. Apologies to PG Co-ordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 October</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present research proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to departmental HDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 October</strong></td>
<td>Departmental Colloquium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:20-12:50. Venue TBA: all PGs to attend. Apologies to PG co-ordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22 October</strong></td>
<td>CH (Module 19) Exam Essay Draft (Metzian Intro)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CH (Module 19) Exam Essay Draft (Metzian Intro)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submit proposal to Faculty for HDC approval at 1 Nov meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23 October</strong></td>
<td>Department Colloquium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:20-12:50. Venue TBA: all PGs to attend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31 October</strong></td>
<td>HPPL Module 1 Research Essay: Hand in 10,000 word final research essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- HPPL Module 1 Research Essay: Hand in 10,000 word final research essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2nd year coursework: Submit minor dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2nd semester full thesis-submissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 November</strong></td>
<td><strong>END OF TERM 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 November</strong></td>
<td>CH (Module 19) Exam Essay</td>
<td>CH (Module 19) Exam Essay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. RESPONSIBILITIES OF POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS

Graduates are expected to use their own judgement and to take responsibility for the consequences of their decisions. If problems affecting study arise or are foreseeable then it is the graduate’s responsibility to take all reasonable steps to mitigate their impact and to inform his or her supervisor, the Co-ordinator of Postgraduate Studies, or the Head of Department as soon as possible.

Graduates are expected to comply with deadlines as set out in the timetable above. Failure to do so will lead to mark penalties, and possibly to a failing mark, or to being disallowed from re-registering.

Graduates engaged in research projects are expected to take active responsibility for their own supervision, initiating meetings with their supervisors, responding to emails in a timely fashion, and generally staying “on the radar”.

Graduates are expected to attend Colloquia and generally to participate in the life of the Department.

Graduates are responsible for ensuring they are correctly registered with the Faculty of Humanities.

Graduates are subject to progress reviews at least annually, at which all of these factors will be taken into consideration.

3. RESEARCH PROPOSALS

Before a Master’s or Doctoral student begins their dissertation, the proposal must be approved by (a) the Department during the time of its presentation (see calendar for dates) and by (b) the Higher Degrees Committee (HDC) of the Faculty of Humanities. The proposal must be completed on a form which can be obtained from the Faculty website https://www.uj.ac.za/faculties/humanities/Pages/Post-Graduate-Information-for-Students-and-Staff.aspx.

Students work with their supervisors until the supervisor judges that they have a viable proposal. Students then defend their proposal before the Department, who give comments and feedback. If necessary, any changes arising from this exercise is incorporated. The proposal is then signed by the supervisor and Head of Department, and submitted to the HDC. Dates for submission in 2019 are:
The HDC may either accept the proposal as is, reject it outright, or require Major Revisions. Major Revisions require the proposal to be resubmitted to a subsequent meeting of the HDC.

Major Revisions are recommended when committee members have difficulty grasping the nature of a project or its importance, and it is therefore imperative to write clearly for a non-philosophical audience in the proposal. Major Revisions are also recommended when the scope of the proposal seems inappropriate for the degree (usually too broad) or if there does
not seem to be a sufficient grasp of the literature or material. Since the members of the committee are mostly non-philosophers, this grasp is often assessed indirectly by the clarity and register of the discussion, which is another reason to write clearly and with authority in the proposal.

FHDC Assessment Criteria. The FHDC reviews proposals to ensure the appropriateness of the proposed study for the given qualification and to assess the students’ capacity to successfully and ethically complete the research, against the following assessment criteria, on which grounds a major revision to a proposal may be required:

(a) Conceptual clarity of the study title and research questions (aim, objectives, etc.) in light of the research problem.
(b) Clarity and feasibility of the methodology to answer the research questions.
(c) Adequacy of a theoretical framework within which to conduct the study.
(d) Overall demonstrated competence to undertake higher degree research at the required level, including writing skills, technical care and appropriate use of literature.
(e) Defensible original scientific contribution (in the case of doctoral proposals).

Source and more info:

4. DEGREE REGULATIONS

Below is a summary for your convenience. For authoritative regulations please refer to the Faculty of Humanities Postgraduate Yearbook 2019, available on the Faculty website.

4.0 Research Essay module – all new postgrads

**Attendance** of the Research Essay module (Module 1/ Module 24) is **compulsory for:**

- All Honours students
- All 1st year MA candidates who have not completed their Honours at the UJ philosophy department
- All PhD students who have **not completed their MA** at the UJ philosophy Department

**Registration** for the Research Essay module (Module 1) is **compulsory for:**

- All Honours students
- **All 1st year MAs** (even if they have done Honours at UJ)

**Completing assignments** for the Research Essay module (Module 1) is **compulsory for:**
- All Honours students
- All 1st year MAs who have not completed their Honours at UJ Philosophy.

4.1 Honours

**Programme code: H7039Q**

Honours students must complete five modules. Modules offered in 2019:

1. **THROUGHOUT THE YEAR**
   
   **Module 1: Research Essay** (PHL8X01)
   
   **Facilitators:** Prof Hennie Lötter (Semester 1); Prof Veli Mitova (Semester 2)
   
   **Classes:** Tuesdays 8:30-10:30

2. **TERM 1**
   
   **Module 9: Hermeneutics** (PHL8X13)
   
   **Facilitator:** Prof Catherine Botha
   
   **Classes:** Mondays and Wednesdays 8:30-10:00

3. **TERM 2**
   
   **Module 4: Applied Ethics** (PHL8X08)
   
   **Facilitator:** Dr Asheel Singh
   
   **Classes:** Mondays and Wednesdays 8:30-10:00

4. **TERM 3**
   
   **Module 8: Epistemology** (PHL8X12)
   
   **Facilitator:** Prof Veli Mitova
   
   **Classes:** Mondays and Wednesdays 9:00-10:30

5. **TERM 4**
   
   **Module 16: Philosophy of Language** (PHL8X20)
   
   **Facilitator:** Dr Chad Harris
   
   **Classes:** Mondays and Wednesdays 9:00-10:30

All classes take place in Mapungubwe Seminar Room at the Philosophy Department, unless otherwise indicated in your study guide.

The Research Essay carries one third of the total credits required for the degree to be awarded. The other four modules carry one sixth each.
Modules

Each of modules 1-4 is taught in a course of seminars lasting one term. Usually, each module requires the submission of one Term Essay, and one Exam Essay. Assessments prescribed in individual modules may, however, differ, and so candidates are encouraged to closely peruse the study guide for each module.

Entrance to the examination is dependent upon attaining a 50% or more average for the term. The Term Assessments together make up 50% of the mark for a module, and the Examination makes up the other 50%. Where applicable, the word limit for Term Essays is usually 2500 words and for Exam Essays 5000 words.

Research Essay

The Research Essay is an independent research exercise which students pursue throughout the year. The word limit is 10,000, not including reference material. Candidates are advised that shorter essays will not be penalized: assessment is based on the scope and quality of work, not its length. As a guideline, Honours Research Essays will usually be 8,000 words to achieve the necessary scope and depth.
### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark (%)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 and below</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>50 is the pass mark. Work scoring less than 50 is not of Honours level. It demonstrates a lack of grasp of the topic, ignorance or misunderstanding of elementary texts or ideas, incoherent reasoning, or other serious shortcomings which prevent it from satisfying the criteria for a pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>Low pass:</td>
<td>A pass mark at Honours indicates that the student has achieved a basic understanding of the material, and has attempted some kind of critical evaluation. Work at the lower end of this category will show basic competence with the material and the elementary form of an essay, including basic attempts at argument and evaluation, but of a rudimentary nature. Work at the higher end of this category may show some merits that would warrant a higher mark but suffer from defects in other respects that prevent awarding one. For example, it may show some original thought and good ideas, but lack rigour; or it may show good understanding and command of the literature, but lack a critical or evaluatory component, or suffer from a lack of direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient admission Master’s</td>
<td>American equivalent: E = 50-60 D = 60-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>High pass:</td>
<td>A mark of 65 or more indicates the potential to continue to Master’s level. Work in this bracket ranges from the clearly competent to the very good. It will be clearly structured, it will cover a suitable range of literature, it will evaluate and criticise as well as describe the material it discusses, it will be generally rigorous and exact, and it may show signs of fruitful independent thinking. This independence need not be a new idea or theory, but can include the development of a novel critique of existing ideas, a new interpretation, an extension of an existing argument, a new reply on behalf of an existing position or author, or a comparative exercise which yields something new. Work at the higher end of this range will either be very competent without quite distinguishing itself, or else will be of distinction level in some respects but marred by defects in others, for example by failing to consider an obvious line of objection, or by being suboptimally structured, or by being very thorough but too pedestrian for distinction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient admission Master’s</td>
<td>American equivalent: C = 65-69 B = 70-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 and above</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>A mark of 75 or more indicates distinction level work. It will be clearly structured, thorough, well-argued, and may display a degree of independent thinking as defined above, and perhaps even originality. It may also display a degree of intellectual confidence either absent from or unwarranted in work of lower standard. One test for distinction level work is whether it is memorable (for the right reasons). Another is whether it provokes thought or questions in the mind of the reader. At Honours level, distinction level work need not be of professional or publishable standard, but it should suggest that the author may at least have the potential to go on to contribute to the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American equivalent: A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The pass mark across all components is 50%. The mark for commendation is 65%. The mark for distinction is 75%.

The following marking scheme includes standard criteria used by external examiners marking your Minor and Major Assignments. It is advisable you keep these in mind when writing your Assignments.

Late submission of work

Late submission of any assessed work usually carries a penalty of 10% plus 10% per 24-hour period elapsed after the deadline.

If the 10000 word research essay is not submitted by 31 October in the first year, the student will have to register again for the research essay module in the following year.

Extensions

If you have a legitimate reason for missing any of your deadlines then you should request an extension, in writing and as soon as possible, from your lecturer. If an extension is requested retrospectively, then the penalty will be applied automatically and revoked only on approval of the extension.

Deadlines form part of the assessment process. Deliberately seeking an extension when no legitimate reason exists amounts to seeking an unfair advantage, that is, cheating.

A legitimate reason for seeking an extension is generally something:

- which you have not chosen; and
- which you could not have prepared for; and
- which seriously affects your ability to complete the work to the standard of which you are capable within the available time; and
- for which a short extension will give you a reasonable chance of attaining that standard.

Examples include bereavement, serious injury, serious illness, fire in your home, and other similar events. You may also qualify if you are called to perform in a high-level sporting or artistic event over whose timing you have no control.

You do not normally qualify for an extension in any of the following circumstances:

- You suffer from some very serious mishap requiring multiple or lengthy extensions. In these circumstances, it is usually necessary to suspend your studies, and resume at a later date.
- You suffer some mishap which prevents you from submitting in time, but which you could have prepared for. Examples include losing your data due to a hard disk failure.
(you could have backed up), suffering from eleventh hour problems emailing your assignment to the lecturer or printing it out (because if you choose to submit at the last minute then you volunteer yourself for such problems), and similar. You are expected to take reasonable steps to minimize your vulnerability to computer gremlins, traffic, and so forth, and you will generally not qualify for an extension if you have not done so.

- You suffer from some mishap that you could not have prepared for, and which affects your work, but which is relatively minor. Examples include minor illnesses, computer problems, and similar. In a course lasting one year, it is inevitable that events will affect your work on occasion. These vicissitudes of life affect everyone and learning to carry on regardless is part of the educational benefit of an intensive course of study such as this one, and something you will have to do if you wish to be successful in any occupation.

- You have a clash with a requirement of an employer. This is a full time course, and you are expected to manage your other commitments in light of this. If you find yourself in a serious difficulty regarding some employment then you must discuss with your lecturer or the PG Co-coordinator.

- You have a cultural, religious or family commitment. It is your responsibility to balance your various choices and commitments, as you will need to do for the rest of your working life. On the other hand, if a serious problem seems likely, then you should raise it at the beginning of the year with your lecturer, so as to make any necessary arrangements well in advance. Events of this kind rarely merit extensions at the last minute as they are generally scheduled well in advance.

A general test of whether a reason for extension is legitimate is to ask yourself: Have I ever heard a lecturer whose competence I respect cite this reason for failing to deliver a lecture? If not, then it is unlikely that you will get an extension.

4.2 Master’s by Coursework

Programme code: M7062Q

The MA by Coursework programme consists of a Research Essay, a Minor Dissertation and four courses, completed over a period of two years of full time study. Which courses are offered in a specific year will be determined by the Department and will be based on, amongst other considerations, the availability of academic staff with the requisite expertise in a field and the interests of students.

MODULES OFFERED IN 2019:

1. THROUGHOUT THE YEAR (compulsory for MAs without UJ Hons)
   Module 24: Research essay (PHL9X11)
   Facilitators: Prof Hennie Lötter (Semester 1); Prof Veli Mitova (Semester 2)
   Classes: Tuesdays 8:30-10:30
2. TERM 1

Module 9: Hermeneutics (PHL9X19)

Facilitator: Prof Catherine Botha

Classes: Mondays and Wednesdays 8:30-10:00

3. TERM 2

Module 4: Applied Ethics (PHL9X14)

Facilitator: Dr Asheel Singh

Classes: Mondays and Wednesdays 8:30-10:00

4. TERM 3

Module 8: Epistemology (PHL9X26)

Facilitator: Prof Veli Mitova

Classes: Mondays and Wednesdays 9:00-10:30

5. TERM 4

Module 16: Philosophy of Language (PHL9X18)

Facilitator: Dr Chad Harris

Classes: Mondays and Wednesdays 9:00-10:30

Modules

Each of the modules 1-4 is taught in a course of seminars lasting one term. Usually, each module is split into one Term Essay, and one Exam Essay. Assessments prescribed in individual modules may, however, differ, and so candidates are encouraged to closely peruse the study guide for each module. Entrance to the examination is only granted if a 50% result is achieved for the term assessments. The word limit for Term Essays is 4000 and for Exam Essays 8000.

Research Essay (year 1) (Module 24: PHL9X11)

The Research Essay is an independent research exercise which students pursue in their first year in preparation for their Minor Dissertation and which they submit at the end of their first year, by 31 October. The word limit is 10000, not including references. Students must receive a pass mark to be eligible to pursue their Minor Dissertation in their second year. Except in exceptional circumstances, failure to pass the Research Essay will lead to de-registration of the MA by Coursework.

Minor dissertation (year 2) (Module 1: PHL9X09 and PHL9X10)

The Minor Dissertation is a continuation of the work undertaken in the Research Essay which students pursue in their second year. The word limit is 25000, not including reference material. Candidates are advised that shorter essays will not be penalized: assessment is based on the
scope and quality of work, not its length. As a guideline, Minor Dissertations of 20000 words will achieve the necessary scope and depth. The Minor Dissertation carries one third of the total credits required for the degree to be awarded. The other four modules carry one sixth each.

**Publishable article**

Submit to your supervisor an article ready for publication in a journal. This is a Faculty rule and applies to all MA students.

The article should be submitted to your supervisor **in the three months after you have submitted your thesis or research essay**. Should your supervisor deem your article to be of sufficient quality, he/she will advise you on whether/how to submit your article to a journal to be considered for publication. This is a great opportunity for you to a) acquire a vital academic skill, and b) make R 20 000 if your article does get published. See § 8 below for more on this.

**Late submission of work**

Late submission of any assessed work carries a penalty of 10% plus 10% per 24 hour period elapsed since the deadline.

The rules that apply for requests for an extension on an Essay in the Honours programme apply in the Master's programme as well. Please refer to the section on the Honours programme.

If the 10000 word research essay is not submitted by 31 October in the first year, the student will have to register again for the research essay module in next year. Note that permission to register again needs to be granted by the department, and is not automatic.

**Assessment**

The pass mark across all components is 50%. The mark for commendation is 65%. The mark for distinction is 75%.

The following marking scheme includes standard criteria used by external examiners marking your Minor and Major Assignments and your Minor Dissertation. It is advisable you keep these in mind when writing your Assignments and Dissertation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark (%)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 and below</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>50 is the pass mark. Work scoring less than 50 is not of Master’s level. It demonstrates no more than a basic grasp of the topic, no more than a basic knowledge of elementary texts or ideas, incoherent reasoning, or other serious shortcomings which prevent it from satisfying the criteria for a pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50-64</strong></td>
<td>Low pass: Insufficient for admission to Doctoral study</td>
<td>A pass mark at Master’s indicates that the student has achieved more than a basic understanding of the material, and has critically and convincingly evaluated the material. Work at the lower end of this category will show reasonable competence with the material, will be reasonably well organized, and will mount some good arguments, but will get little further than this. The arguments may not be well explored, a full range of objections may not be considered, and obvious gaps in the treatment may remain. Work at the higher end of this category may show some merits that would warrant a higher mark but suffer from defects in other respects that prevent awarding one. For example, it may show some original thought and good ideas, but lack rigour; or it may show good understanding and command of the literature, but lack a sufficiently convincing or thorough critical or evaluatory component, or suffer from some confusion in direction or flaws in organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>65-74</strong></td>
<td>High pass: Sufficient for admission to Doctoral study</td>
<td>A mark of 65 or more indicates the potential to continue to Doctoral level research. Work in this bracket range is very good. It will be clearly structured, it will cover a suitable range of literature, it will evaluate and criticise as well as describe the material it discusses; it will be generally rigorous and exact, and it may show signs of fruitful independent thinking. This independence need not be a new idea or theory, but can include the development of a novel critique of existing ideas, a new interpretation, an extension of an existing argument, a new reply on behalf of an existing position or author, or a comparative exercise which yields something new. Work at the higher end of this range will either be very competent without quite distinguishing itself, or else will be of distinction level in some respects but marred by defects in others, for example by failing to consider an obvious line of objection, or by being suboptimally structured, or by being very thorough but too pedestrian for distinction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>75 and above</strong></td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>A mark of 75 or more indicates distinction level work. It will be clearly structured, thorough, well-argued, and may display a degree of originality as defined above. It may also display a degree of intellectual confidence either absent from or unwarranted in work of lower standard. One test for distinction level work is whether it is memorable (for the right reasons). Another is whether it provokes thought or questions in the mind of the reader. At Master’s level, work in the 75-79 range will suggest the potential for publication, while a mark of 80 or suggests material that is already close to publishable standard, with the requisite format modifications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Master’s by Dissertation

Programme code: M7040Q

In addition to the Coursework Master’s, the Department also offers a Master’s by Dissertation. The normal route for Master’s study is the Coursework Master’s, and admission to the Dissertation programme is exceptional. An applicant usually needs to convince the Department that she has the necessary research skills and background philosophical knowledge to conduct self-directed study, that she has identified a suitable topic, that she has identified a suitable and willing supervisor, and that she is likely to complete the Dissertation within two years.

Dissertation

The word limit for the dissertation is 45,000 words, not including reference material. Candidates are advised that shorter dissertations will not be penalized: assessment is based on the scope and quality of work, not its length. As a guideline, Master’s dissertations will usually need to exceed 35,000 words to achieve the necessary scope and depth.

Master’s students are expected to have completed the majority of their supervised work by 30 June of their second year (third year if part time), and to use the period 30 June - 31 October as a “final touches” period. During this time, the focus is typically on writing rather than reading, and contact with the supervisor is typically less frequent.

If a student has not completed by 31 October then an assessment must be made whether the student is likely to complete in the fifth registered semester (seventh if part time). Only in exceptional circumstances will a student be permitted to continue past a fifth (or seventh) semester. Accordingly students who are not likely to complete in their fifth (or seventh) semester should de-register with a view to re-registering when whatever issues are causing delay have been addressed.

Publishable article

Submit to your supervisor an article ready for publication in a journal. This is a Faculty rule and applies to all MA students.

The article should be submitted to your supervisor in the two months after you have submitted your thesis or research essay. Should your supervisor deem your article to be of sufficient quality, he/she will advise you on whether/how to submit your article to a journal to be considered for publication. This is a great opportunity for you to a) acquire a vital academic skill, and b) make R 20 000 if your article does get published.
4.4 Doctorate

Programme code: P7021Q

Thesis

Doctoral assessment is by submission of a thesis. The word limit is 80,000 words, not including reference material. Candidates are advised that shorter theses will not be penalized: assessment is based on the scope and quality of work, not its length. As a guideline, doctoral theses will usually need to exceed 60,000 words to achieve the necessary scope and depth.

Doctoral students are expected to have completed the majority of their supervised work by 30 June of their third year (fourth year if part time), and to use the period 1 July - 31 October as a “final touches” period. During this time, the focus is typically on writing rather than reading, and contact with the supervisor is typically less frequent.

If a student has not completed by 31 October then an assessment must be made whether the student is likely to complete in the seventh registered semester (ninth if part time). Only in exceptional circumstances will a student be permitted to continue past a seventh (or ninth) semester. Accordingly students who are not likely to complete in their seventh (or ninth) semester should de-register with a view to re-registering when whatever issues are causing delay have been addressed.

Publishable articles

Submit to your supervisor two (2) articles ready for publication in a journal. This is a Faculty rule and applies to all PhD students.

The articles should be submitted to your supervisor in the three months after you have submitted your thesis or research essay. Should your supervisor deem your article/s to be of sufficient quality, he/she will advise you on whether/how to submit your article/s to a journal to be considered for publication. This is a great opportunity for you to a) acquire a vital academic skill, and b) make R 20 000 if your article does get published. See more about this in § 8 below.

Viva

All students are expected to defend their PhD at a Viva Voce, after they submit. This is an oral exam during which your examiners ask you questions about the thesis that they feel need further clarification or defence.

4.5 Proposal phase: Pre-registration

MA Research and PhD candidates have the following option:
The student formally registers for the proposal phase: pre-registration to qualify for research supervision. Thereafter, master’s students have six and doctoral students nine months to complete their research proposals to the standards required by the relevant Faculty and University policy. During this time, they have access to the University resources that they require to formulate their research proposals. Students may not undertake any data collection or any activities related to data collection prior to ethical clearance and the acceptance of the proposal by the relevant structure within the Faculty.

Although master’s proposals should be ready within six months of registration for the master’s degree and doctoral proposals within nine months of registration for the doctoral degree, proposals must serve at the FHDC within the first year of registration (excluding the proposal phase: pre-registration period).

All proposals serving after the first year must be accompanied by a letter of motivation from the student detailing (1) why the proposal has taken so long to prepare, and (2) how they intend to complete the degree within the maximum period permitted (see § 5 below). This motivation must be supported by the supervisor.

5. MAXIMUM PERIODS OF STUDY PERMITTED

**MA:** full time – 2 years; part time – 3 years

**PhD:** full time – 4 years; part-time – 5 years

**Note:** If a student exceeds the maximum period of his or her degree he or she cannot obtain a distinction no matter how good her mark.

**Rule:** Hence, the Philosophy Department requires that if you are working more than 14 hours a week (e.g., as a tutor, or any other job), you must register part-time.

6. ANNUAL PROGRESS REVIEW AND PROPOSAL PRESENTATION

The Department annually reviews the progress of all Master’s and Doctoral students. This exercise takes place in the first week of August.

First year Master’s and Doctoral students submit their research proposal to the Postgraduate Coordinator who circulates it to the Department as per deadlines set previously in this guide. Students then do a 10-minute presentation of their proposal to the members of staff and other graduate students. (For dates, see Timetable above.)

The purpose of this exercise is to develop the oral and presentational skills of 1st year Master’s and Doctoral students and receive feedback from staff and peers on the arguments and ideas they have developed in their 1st year of research.
2nd and 3rd year Doctoral students submit one chapter and an outline or plan for completion to their supervisor and one other permanent member of academic staff. All three then meet to discuss. The student is required to minute the discussion and any decisions taken during the meeting. The supervisor and member of the review board jointly report back to the Department on the state of the project, the prospects for timely completion, and the quality of the work.

This is an opportunity to obtain feedback from someone other than the supervisor, and ought not to worry the conscientious student. Nonetheless, it is a formal assessment exercise and inadequate progress may result in the suspension or discontinuation of studies.

7. Submitting Work – Requirements

The following standard guidelines apply to all submitted work unless directed otherwise.

All submissions on Turnitin

All module essays, research essays (Hons and MA), theses and dissertations must be submitted to Turnitin, for plagiarism purposes. If you want to test your work for plagiarism, go to Blackboard Module CM0226 (UJ Postgraduate Philosophy Community)

CM0226 17PHL8X01-PHL9x11-PHL10X1-PHL10X2 - UJ PHILOSOPHY POSTGRADUATE COMMUNITY.

Research essays, theses and dissertations must be accompanied by a plagiarism report.

Formatting

ALL submitted work (including research essays and proposals) should be formatted in 12 point font, Times New Roman or similar standard font, with double spaced lines, and margins of at least 2.5cm on all sides. Pages should be clearly numbered. If the work includes multiple chapters then a table of contents should be included, showing at least the starting page of each chapter.

Referencing

The Harvard Method of referencing is the preferred method at the department. Note that the rule is that if you are referencing a direct quote, you must provide the page number when your reference (example: (Reed 2002: 12)). If you are paraphrasing, it is advisable to also include the page number in your reference. See § III, 3. How to Reference below.

Statement

All submitted work should include the following statement directly after the title page: “This [Essay/Research Essay/Dissertation/Thesis] is the result of my own work and includes nothing
which is the outcome of work done in collaboration except where specifically indicated in the text.” If any part of the work has been previously published or is based on work that has previously been published, this should be mentioned on the same page, and the reference given.

All submitted work should include the following statement below the above: “This [Essay/Research Essay/Dissertation/Thesis] contains X words including footnotes and appendices but excluding reference material.”

Abstract

All submitted work should include an abstract of the thesis.

UJ policy: ‘An abstract in English of no more than 500 words, describing the problem statement, the most important methods followed and the most important results obtained, must appear in the front of every minor dissertation, dissertation or thesis.’

Copies

An electronic copy must always be submitted by email to the supervisor or else as directed in MS Word-readable format, for plagiarism detection, word count, and other checks.

In addition, the following requirements apply.

7.1 Master’s Dissertation

Submissions should be to Ms Mercial Samms (mercials@uj.ac.za ; Room 237, C-Ring2, APK).

The following check list items should be met by all students who intend to submit their research for assessment:

1) You must have formally registered for your research degree (dissertations/theses)/the research component of your degree (minor dissertations).

2) The assessors for your research examination must have been approved.

3) If the title or line of your research has changed, approval must have been granted by the Higher Degrees Committee prior to you submitting for assessment.

4) If you have change of supervisor(s) approval, this must have been granted by the Higher Degrees Committee prior to you submitting for assessment.

5) Should you have required Ethics, your formal ethics clearance should be included in your submission.
6) The formal Humanities One-Stop-Form must be completed and signed off as part of your submission for assessment; please ensure that it is the most recent version.

7) A digital copy of your minor dissertation/dissertation/thesis in PDF format. Students will be informed by their supervisor whether hard copies are required by external examiners.

8) The Affidavit for Master's and Doctoral Students, signed by you in the presence of a Commissioner of Oaths (which confirms the work is your own);

9) The Permission to Submit form, signed by your supervisor in PDF format.

10) A full Turnitin report downloaded from Turnitin.

All forms can be obtained from the Faculty website:

https://www.uj.ac.za/faculties/humanities/Pages/Post-Graduate-Information-for-Students-and-Staff.aspx

If your supervisor is not willing for you to submit, then there is a procedure by which you may still do so without permission. Contact the PG Co-ordinator, the Head of Department, or the Faculty for details. Please note that if a supervisor does not grant his/her consent that means that there is a serious problem with the thesis, and the student is taking a big risk in submitting it.

The faculty requires that all students who have completed a Master's by dissertation also produce one publishable article before the degree may be conferred. Please ensure that you discuss this with your supervisor and complete the article once you have submitted your dissertation for examination.

7.2 Doctoral Thesis

Submissions should be to Ms Mercial Samms (mercials@uj.ac.za; Room 237, C-Ring2, APK).

The following check list items should be met by all students who intend to submit their research for assessment:

1) You must have formally registered for your research degree (dissertations/theses)/the research component of your degree (minor dissertations).

2) The assessors for your research examination must have been approved.

3) If the title or line of your research has changed, approval must have been granted by the Higher Degrees Committee prior to you submitting for assessment.
4) If you have change of supervisor(s) approval, this must have been granted by the Higher Degrees Committee prior to you submitting for assessment.

5) Should you have required Ethics, your formal ethics clearance should be included in your submission.

6) The formal Humanities One-Stop-Form must be completed and signed off as part of your submission for assessment; please ensure that it is the most recent version.

7) A digital copy of your minor dissertation/dissertation/thesis in PDF format. Students will be informed by their supervisor whether hard copies are required by external examiners.

8) The Affidavit for Master’s and Doctoral Students, signed by you in the presence of a Commissioner of Oaths (which confirms the work is your own);

9) The Permission to Submit form, signed by your supervisor in PDF format.

10) A full Turnitin report downloaded from Turnitin.

All forms can be obtained from the Faculty website:

https://www.uj.ac.za/faculties/humanities/Pages/Post-Graduate-Information-for-Students-and-Staff.aspx

If your supervisor is not willing for you to submit, then there is a procedure by which you may still do so without permission. Contact the PG Co-ordinator, the Head of Department, or the Faculty for details. Please note that if a supervisor does not grant his/ her consent that means that there is a serious problem with the thesis, and the student is taking a big risk in submitting it.

The requirements for successfully completing a PhD at UJ include a candidate submitting two publishable papers to his/her supervisor in addition to the thesis itself. All PhD students need to attend the course on 1) “Publishing an article” that will be presented every year and 2) submit TWO articles for publication within no more than one year after submission of the thesis for examination. Proof of submission needs to be sent to the supervisor.
II. SUPPORT

1. KEY CONTACTS

PG Co-ordinator:
Prof Catherine Botha
Email address: cbotha@uj.ac.za
Phone number: 011 559 3403.

Tutor Co-ordinator:
Prof Hennie Lötter
Email address: hpplotter@uj.ac.za
Phone number: 011 559 2734.

Head of Department:
Prof Veli Mitova
Email address: vmitova@uj.ac.za
Phone number: 011 559 3133.

Departmental Administrator:
Mrs Nicolene Marks
Email address: nmarks@uj.ac.za
Phone number: 011 559 2337.

Faculty Administrator (Doctoral and Master’s (by dissertation) students):
Mrs Nosi Seranyane
Email address: nosis@uj.ac.za
Phone number: 011 559 2051

Faculty Administrator (Honours and Master’s (by coursework) students):
Mrs Adeshnee Reddy
Email address: areddy@uj.ac.za
Phone number: 011 559 2660

2. ALL FORMS AND DOCUMENTS TO BE OBTAINED FROM

https://www.uj.ac.za/faculties/humanities/Pages/Post-Graduate-Information-for-Students-and-Staff.aspx
3. **General Financial Assistance**

If you encounter financial difficulties that threaten your studies, you should always talk to your Supervisor or the PG Co-ordinator.

General information on sources of financial assistance is available at https://www.uj.ac.za/faculties/humanities/Pages/Fees-and-Bursaries.aspx

4. **Tutoring at the Department**

The department sports an excellent and very lively tutoring programme at all undergraduate levels.

Application calls for tutorships are usually issued at the end of each year.

Our Tutor co-ordinator is Prof Lötter. He offers a world-class training programme to those who are selected.

5. **Lecturing at the Department**

The department sometimes offers temporary lecturing positions. The route to them is as follows:

1) You must have worked as a tutor;
2) You must have indicated willingness to do guest lectures;
3) You must apply to attend UJ opportunities for training young lecturers.

6. **Printing Costs**

Please note that due to severe budget cuts, the department cannot do any printing for students.

Supervisors/administrative staff are not permitted to print the examination/final copies of theses and dissertations for our postgraduate students. Students are required to bear these costs themselves, so please budget for this.

Supervisors/administrative staff are not permitted to print research material (book chapters/articles) for our postgraduate students. Please print your own documents at the UJ facilities provided for students.
7. **Travel Bookings Procedures for PGs and PDRFs**

The department has some limited funding for supporting postgrads to attend conferences. Please note that funding is not guaranteed.

1) Discuss your plans to present a paper at a conference with your supervisor and get his/her approval.

2) Obtain acceptance of your paper for presentation from the organizers of the conference where applicable.

3) Email the departmental post-graduate coordinator:
   
   (a) a motivation for the proposed travel
   (b) evidence of an invitation to present a paper at a conference
   (c) a budget, attaching quotations.

Your budget should include all costs that you expect to incur, for example, air travel, airport transfers, visa application costs, accommodation, and conference fees (remember that PG students can often apply to conference organisers to have this cost waived due to their PG status).

4) Get your own quotations, make your bookings and pay using your own credit card.

5) Present your talk to the department for approval and feedback.

6) Once you have received confirmation from the PG coordinator that the department/your supervisor/the Faculty will be able to fund your travel, take careful note of the restrictions on that confirmation.

7) In order for you to claim, submit the following documents to the department:

   (a) Invoice
   (b) Proof of payment (bank or credit card statement)
   (c) UJ Payment Requisition Form (available from the departmental office manager). Remember to sign as the applicant on that form.
   (d) A completed UJ Travel Application Checklist
   (e) A supporting memorandum plus supporting documents as required on the checklist (again, you will need to ask your supervisor/PG coordinator to provide the financial statement of the cost centre from which the funds must come).
   (f) A report on the conference, including a description of:

   - how you talk went;
   - what sort of feedback you got and what you learnt from it;
   - what other talks you went to and what you learnt from them.

Please note, due to the 2016-2019 budget cuts:

- we can no longer guarantee financial assistance to all students;
- we are unlikely to be able to assist with international conferences.
8. How to Claim Money from the Faculty for Publications

In case you publish an essay in an accredited journal, you are entitled to a certain amount of money from the Faculty.

NOTE: A student/research associate/post-doctoral fellow must claim for a DHET accredited published article in the year in which it appears in print. Claims submitted after this period will not be entertained.

To claim this money, you will need to follow these steps:

(a) As from 2016, students simply need to load their publications onto Research Output System (your supervisor will be able to do that for you if you do not have access), and wait for the Research Officer to contact them. If the research officer does not contact you within a couple of weeks after the close of the relevant call, please contact the postgrad coordinator.

(b) The Humanities Faculty Accountant will then provide you with a FINPG-1 Form to complete your UJ account details. This form needs to be stamped and signed by the Vice Dean Research before returning it to the Humanities Faculty Accountant.

(c) Submit the stamped and signed FINPG-1 Form to one of the cashiers in the Student Finance Office, who will credit your UJ account.

(d) Once the money is reflected in your UJ account, complete the UJ Refund Form, which you can download from here:

http://www.uj.ac.za/EN/StudyatUJ/StudentFinance/Documents/APPLICATION%20FOR%20REFUND%202015.pdf

Attach to it a copy of all the relevant documents: ID, proof of personal banking details, plus a memo from the Vice Dean of Research stating that you are eligible for the Refund. Submit the Refund Form to one of the cashiers in the Student Finance Office.

9. Study Facilities

Should you wish to work on site, you may apply to the Head of the Department for permission to use a desk in the post-doctoral fellow office. Space will be allocated on a first come, first served basis, and keys must be signed in and out from the Office manager every day. Alternatively, the University has a Postgraduate Centre, located in A-parking on APK Campus. You can find workspace and photocopying facilities there. The library on APK also provides workspaces for postgraduate students that can be reserved.

The Department also has one laptop to loan to graduate students. You should enquire with the Office Manager. Note that the laptop can only be used within the Department and may on no account be taken outside it.
10. PROBLEMS

Lawyers say, “Delay defeats equity.” If you encounter a problem that affects your study then you must let your Supervisor, your Lecturer or the Postgraduate Co-ordinator know as soon as possible. If you don’t, then the chance of successful resolution falls sharply. Make an appointment with your Supervisor or Lecturer to discuss any issues that might affect your work. If you do not feel able to talk to your Supervisor or Lecturer then contact the PG Co-ordinator or the Head of Department.

11. GRIEVANCES

If you have any kind of grievance you should always raise it as soon and as calmly as possible. In the first instance you should seek to discuss it with the individual concerned, if you feel able to do so. If that is not satisfactory then you should approach the PG Co-ordinator or the Head of Department for advice and information on the formal grievance procedures available within the Faculty and University. It is a precondition of formal grievance procedures that less formal approaches have been exhausted, so avoid the temptation to “leapfrog” to the highest available arbiter unless you have compelling reasons to think that a more local resolution is impossible or undesirable.

12. ETIQUETTE - WORKING WITH A SUPERVISOR

1. Choosing a supervisor

Arrange a meeting with a prospective supervisor. Don’t be late for this meeting. Take notes and ensure you have prepared any questions you may have. Once you have concluded the meeting, be explicit about your meeting with other prospective supervisors. Once you have made your decision, let the supervisor with whom you would like to work know, so that s/he can confirm whether this is still feasible. Once this is confirmed, let the other lecturers you consulted know of your decision.

2. Emailing your supervisor

Most lecturers prefer to be contacted by email rather than a phone call or a drop in due to their busy schedules. All lecturers are very good at replying. If you’ve heard nothing within two days, try again. Persistence pays.

3. Communicating with your supervisor

Your supervisor should not have to hound you for work. If you are encountering a problem, or anticipate missing a deadline, send your supervisor an e-mail immediately.
III. How To...

1. HOW TO READ PHILOSOPHY

Reading philosophy is not like reading a novel, a newspaper article, or an email. Most philosophical writing is difficult to read. Even great philosophers find philosophy difficult to read: Ludwig Wittgenstein is supposed to have called it “a kind of agony”. So if you struggle, don’t worry: you are in illustrious company.

It is therefore useful to be aware of a few techniques you can use to get the most out of reading a philosophical text. The following steps are not intended as a prescription for everyone, or for every text, but they might help you.

1. **Skim first.** Start by skimming through the whole thing, not reading carefully, but just trying to get an idea of the “gist”. Sometimes the point of a piece is to be found on the final page, and if you spend hours exhausting yourself on the first half then you might miss it.

2. **Realise not all pages are created equal.** When you have finished skimming, revisit those passages that appear to you to be particularly important. This requires you to think first about which passages are important, and this is a key step towards understanding. It also ensures you spend your time on the important parts. You may need to go over some paragraphs several times; others will require only a single reading; and others will be somewhere in between. In general, once you have got an idea of the overall gist, you should feel free to jump around in the text. You should not feel that you have to plough through from beginning to end in the way that you would with a novel.

3. **Ask questions.** When you are studying a paragraph in detail, ask: Why does the author believe that? Does this follow? Is this meant to be an argument, or is the author expecting that I will agree without an argument? Why has the author spent so much time on this point, or so little? How does this fit with other things the author has said elsewhere in this piece, or in other pieces I have encountered?

4. **Construct counterexamples.** See if you can dream up examples of things which would prove the author wrong. For example, if the author claims that humans are rational animals, see if you can think of things that would count as human but are not rational. Be as inventive and fantastical as you like with this process: many great philosophical examples are thoroughly fantastical.

5. **Be charitable.** If there are two things that an author might have meant, and one of them is ridiculous, then you should assume that they meant the other one. Similarly, if it seems to you that what an author is saying is ridiculous, then see if you can reinterpret it or supplement it with assumptions or arguments so that it is as strong as possible. Proper criticism requires ideas to have a fair hearing, and since the author is not there to speak for what they have written, you have to play the role of advocate before you criticise.
6. **Know when to stop.** If you don’t understand something after thinking about it hard and reading it several times, you should consider the possibility that the author has written something which does not make sense. Philosophy is as hard to write as it is to read, and much great philosophy is arguably unintelligible. It could be that your failure to understand is not a failure at all, but a reflection of the difficulty of the underlying philosophical question. If you suspect this is the case, then you should see whether the lecture answers your questions, and if not you should ask your Lecturer or Tutor.

2. **HOW TO WRITE PHILOSOPHY**

Philosophy is a discipline where linguistic precision is vital. Many of our students, including many of our best, do not have English as a mother tongue. Nonetheless, when they write they produce clear, grammatical, well-structured prose. You, too, are expected to write English well, whether or not English is your mother tongue. If this is a challenge for you then you must avail yourself of the services of the UJ Writing Centre.

The following piece by Peter Lipton contains excellent and widely-used advice, but you can also consult other guides here:


---

**Writing Philosophy**

Peter Lipton

“Style is the feather in the arrow, not the feather in the cap.”

**I. Awkwardness**

Awkward writing makes the reader uncomfortable. It is ungrammatical, unclear, choppy, or just too difficult to follow. One case of awkward writing is not using your own words. Instead, you rely on the phrases and constructions of the author you are discussing. The resulting mixture of your author’s style and your own is almost always awkward. Even if you are describing someone else’s views, use your words. The most general and important cause of awkwardness, however, is simply the failure to revise. Most writers produce awkward sentences the first time around; good writers take the time to review their writing and know how to spot awkwardness and how to eliminate it. You should assume that the first draft of each sentence will have to be fixed up. Writing on a word processor may make the revision easier and less time-consuming. The best way to test for awkwardness is to read your draft aloud. Most people have a better ear than eye, and if it sounds good it will usually read well. If you do have any doubts about your ear, W. Strunk and E.B. White, *The Elements of Style*, London:

II. Empathy

Once you understand something, it is difficult to remember what it was like not to understand it; but you have to do this to get your point across. To write effectively you must put yourself in the reader's shoes. (Pretend that your reader is a friend not in the class rather than the teacher.) The reader cannot read your mind and she hasn't just spent five hours thinking about your topic. So she needs plenty of help. Don't just make your point, explain it. Give an example. Approach it from several angles. Above all, keep your writing concrete, even in as abstract a subject as philosophy, because abstract writing loses the reader. In addition to keeping your reader on board, empathy helps you to figure out what it will take to convince her that what you write is true. You already believe it yourself, but your reader needs an argument. Think of yourself as selling your point of view, or as defending yourself in front of a jury.

III. Choreography

An essay is not a list of sentences: it has structure. The structure should be obvious to the reader. Write informative introductions and conclusions. The introduction should not only introduce the topic, it should introduce your argument. That means that you should tell the reader what you are going to prove and how you are going to prove it. Unless the introduction gives the reader a clear map of the essay, she is likely to get lost. Be direct and specific. Replace sentences like 'Throughout the centuries, the greatest minds have pondered the intractable problem of free will' with 'In this essay, I will show that free will is impossible'. The conclusion of the essay should tell the reader what has been accomplished and why the struggle was worthwhile. It should remind the reader how the different moves in the body of the essay fit together to form a coherent argument.

Think of your essay as composed of a series of descriptive and argumentative moves. Each major move deserves a paragraph. Generally speaking, a paragraph should start with a transition sentence or a topic sentence. A transition sentence indicates how the paragraph follows from the previous one; a topic sentence says what the paragraph is about. Both types of sentences are really miniature maps. In the middle of a paragraph you may want to give another map, explaining how the move you are making here is connected to others you have made or will make. The order of your paragraphs is crucial. The reader should have a clear sense of development and progress as she reads. Later paragraphs should build on what has come before, and the reader should have a feeling of steady forward motion. To achieve this effect, you must make sure that your sentences hang together. Think about glue. You can get glue from maps, from transition sentences and words, and especially from the logic of your argument.
IV. Originality

There is room for originality even when you are out to give an accurate description of someone else's position. You can be original by using your own words, your own explanations, and your own examples. Of course in a critical essay there is much more scope for original work: most of the arguments should be your own. This worries some beginning philosophy students, who think they don't know how to come up with their own arguments. Do not deceive yourself: Plato did not use up all the good and easy moves, nor do you have to be a Plato to come up with original philosophy. It is difficult to teach creativity, but here are three techniques that may help. First, make distinctions. For example, instead of talking about knowledge in general, distinguish knowledge based on what others tell you from knowledge based on your own observation. Often, once you make a good distinction, you will see a fruitful and original line of argument. Second, consider comebacks. If you make an objection to one of Plato's arguments, do not suppose that he would immediately admit defeat. Instead, make a reply on his behalf: the resulting 'dialectic' will help you with your own arguments. Lastly, play the why game. As you learned as a child, whatever someone says, you can always ask why. Play that game with your own claims. By forcing yourself to answer a few of those 'why's' you will push your own creativity. The technique of the why game suggests a more general point. Often the problem is not lack of originality; it is rather that the originality is not exploited. When you have a good point, don't throw it away in one sentence. Make the most of it: explain it, extend it, give an example, and show connections. Push your own good ideas as deep as they will go.

© Peter Lipton

3. How To Reference

Alex Broadbent

Correct referencing is important for three reasons: to avoid plagiarism (see below); to help the reader place your work in a wider intellectual landscape; and to give your ideas credibility, by showing that you are aware of what others have said about the same topic. In principle, you can use any style of referencing, so long as you are consistent throughout your piece. In practice, most philosophers use a “Harvard” or “author-date” style, with a footnote style being second choice. In my view, the author-date system is slightly preferable because it allows you to reserve footnotes for substantive comments, and it means the knowledgeable reader can tell what is being referred to without breaking her reading. Also, the author-date system usually makes easier to eliminate referencing material from the word-count.

I would discourage you from using endnote referencing systems found in scientific papers, where the function of referencing is generally to provide authority or further information on a point. These systems are not helpful for the humanities in general, since they make the reference maximally opaque, and since page numbers are often
required in humanities disciplines.

I would strongly encourage you to make use of a free referencing program such as the Zotero plug-in for the Firefox web browser. This makes referencing much faster, easier and more accurate. It will take care of formatting your references correctly, and in the long run you will build up a database of references, which is extremely useful.

In case you wish to format your references manually, here is an example of an acceptable author-date system.

**An Example Author-Date System**

To refer to an entire article, book or other work in the text, you use the author’s surname and the year of publication in brackets. For example:

As Alex Broadbent has argued, mustard is an exquisite accompaniment to macaroni cheese (Broadbent 2007).

If the author has more than one article in the same year they are marked a, b, etc:

Broadbent has elaborated on the use of mustard to flavour savoury dishes in a number of influential articles (Broadbent 2007, 2009a, 2009b, 2011).

It is usually desirable to provide page-numbers rather than refer a reader to an entire article, and page numbers are essential when quotes are used. Note also that if it is already clear from the context who the author under discussion, the name can be omitted, and just the year used. So you might write:

As Broadbent puts it, “Mustard is a must-have” (2009b: 227).

Quotes longer than about 20 words should be presented as a separate and indented paragraph, as I have been presenting these quotes from your imaginary essay on my culinary views. The reference is placed in brackets on a new line below the quote. So suppose I were quoting this passage from page 14 of your essay, I would present it like this:

As Alex Broadbent has argued, mustard is an exquisite accompaniment to macaroni cheese (Broadbent 2007). Broadbent has elaborated on the use of mustard to flavour savoury dishes in a number of influential articles (Broadbent 2007, 2009a, 2009b, 2011). As Broadbent puts it, “Mustard is a must-have” (2009b: 227).

(Honours student 2011: 14)

And then I would carry on with my commentary here.

The citation of older texts is usually governed by accepted conventions. For example,
Kant’s work is cited by paragraph; Hume’s work may be cited by the relevant book/part etc, as is Aristotle’s; and so on. Instead of author-date, you may prefer to use the name of the text when citing a work whose date of publication is not known, for example (Physics, Bk II, Pt 3). For older texts you should list the publication details of the text you have used in the bibliography as if it were any other book.

The author-date system always requires a bibliography at the end of the document, which is additionally useful for readers. All and only items referred to should be included in the bibliography.

Articles should be presented in a consistent style, such as:


Journals typically have both a volume number and an issue number. Here, the volume is 56 and the issue is 3. The issue number is not essential. All the other information is essential, however.

To cite a book:


Note that the edition number is only necessary if there has been more than one edition.

You may also have to cite a paper that appears in a collection. If the paper was first published in the collection then this is straightforward and should be done like this:


The page numbers refer to the pages at which the paper in question is found.

If the paper has appeared elsewhere first and is being reprinted then referencing can be awkward. It is best to give original publication details and then give details of the volume subsequently, indicating that you have used the latter for your page numbers – like this:


Websites are tricky to cite since they often don’t present authorship or date clearly. You should make an effort to provide this information nonetheless. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy provides this information. You should also include the date
the website was accessed. Here are a couple of examples.


Remember that these are just conventions – there is no single right way to present references, provided that you are consistent and that your provide accurate information about the work you are citing. If in doubt, refer to a reputable journal or book, or use your common sense.

### 4. HOW TO AVOID PLAGIARISM

Plagiarism is the passing off of another’s ideas as your own. The simplest form is copying; the most common is pasting a passage from an internet resource into your essay.

If you are tempted to commit plagiarism then you should be aware that you are likely to be detected. The Department of Philosophy checks all work submitted for assessment at postgraduate level and takes plagiarism extremely seriously. Intentional plagiarism is dishonest: it amounts to intellectual theft. You take a serious risk with your career if you commit it.

Some students also commit plagiarism unintentionally. This is not dishonest, but it does cast serious doubt on your judgement and academic abilities. The following advice is intended to help you avoid unintentional plagiarism.

The University of Johannesburg has strict rules concerning plagiarism and nothing here replaces, modifies, or in any way affects those rules or any definitions they may include.

The UJ Plagiarism policy can be found here:


**Plagiarism**

Richard Dennis [adapted]

To avoid plagiarism please bear in mind when presubmitting work:

1. Direct quotations should be in quotation marks, with reference to the source,
including page numbers.

2. Indirect/paraphrased quotations and borrowed ideas should be acknowledged by means of a reference.

3. A full bibliography of work consulted and used should be appended to the essay.

Below is attached an example of what is, and what is not, plagiarism, prepared by Richard Dennis of the Geography Department at UCL [University College London]. If you are concerned about this in your own work, please discuss the matter with your Tutor.

An example: Observations on Class Struggle

Richard Dennis

1. The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat. Masses of labourers, crowded into the factory, are organised like soldiers. Not only are they slaves of the bourgeois class, and of the bourgeois State; they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine, by the overseer, and, above all, by the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

This is plagiarism. There is no attempt to indicate that these are not Richard Dennis's own thoughts but are words taken direct from different parts of the Communist Manifesto.

2. Marx and Engels noted that the history of all hitherto existing society had been the history of class struggles. Society as a whole was more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat. They observed that proletarians had nothing to lose but their chains. They had a world to win.

This is still plagiarism. Although the ideas are attributed to Marx and Engels, there is no indication that the form of words is not Richard Dennis's. Just changing it into the past tense doesn't make it original.

3. In The Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels (1973 edn., p. 40) noted that 'The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles'. They argued that society was 'more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat' (p. 41). 'Masses of labourers, crowded into the factory' were 'organised like soldiers ... slaves of the bourgeois class, and of the bourgeois State' (p. 52). They concluded that 'The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win' (p. 96).
This is not plagiarism, but if all your essay consists of is a set of quotations stitched together, it doesn’t suggest that you have thought about or understood the contents of the quotations. So Richard Dennis wouldn’t earn very many marks from me for this effort!

4. In one of the most famous first sentences ever written, Marx and Engels (1973 edn., p 40) began The Communist Manifesto thus: 'The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.' They went on to exemplify this claim by showing how the structure of society had, in their view, developed into two interdependent but antagonistic classes: bourgeoisie and proletariat. The latter comprised factory operatives, who had been reduced to no more than slave labour; but as they became concentrated geographically, in the great factory towns of the industrial revolution, so they had the opportunity to organise themselves politically. Hence, the authors' conclusion that a communist revolution was not only desirable, but possible, leading them to issue their equally famous final exhortation (p. 96): 'WORKING MEN OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!'

This may not be a very profound commentary, but at least I've tried!

© Richard Dennis 1989

5. HOW TO MANAGE YOUR TIME

There was a time when effective time management was not necessary for academic success. That time is past. Do not model your attitude to time management on the example of senior figures you may have encountered with their heads apparently in the clouds. The modern academic world punishes delay and rewards promptitude. Whether one regards that as a good thing or not, effective time-management is now key to academic success. Moreover it is key to obtaining that success without losing the goodwill of your teachers, friends and family. It is central for obtaining financial security, for success on the job market, for psychological well-being, and generally for making your experience of graduate study a happy one.

Graduate studies present a time management challenge of two kinds. First, extended projects themselves require careful time management. Second, graduate students almost always need to balance the requirements of their academic work against the requirements of one or more jobs.

The key to both challenges is to start early and work consistently. Do not wait until halfway through your degree before getting serious. Start working hard at the beginning, and keep it up. Meet regularly with your supervisor. Be prepared to remind your supervisor in the unlikely event that s/he forgets about your deadlines.

It is sensible to work on your project in chunks. Typically, the convenient chunk is a chapter. There are times when you need to lift your head and take a view of the whole
project, but as a rule it is better to focus on getting just the bit you are working on in shape, and not to worry unduly about the project as a whole. Too much worrying of this kind can lead to paralysis and endless revision.

It is important that you start writing in your first term of your first year. Do not try to read first, write later. You will never finish reading and you will underestimate the difficulty of writing. When you come to write you will probably have written nothing serious for some time, and you will be shocked by the challenge of this entirely different activity. You will probably conclude that you have not read enough, and go back to reading. Your next attempt to write will be even more painful. This cycle is hard to break and thus best avoided. It is easy to avoid: send your supervisor written work regularly, and from the outset. That way you will develop your writing skills alongside your knowledge base.

In order to balance commitments effectively you will need to make space for each. Use a weekly timetable, where you allocate a certain number of hours to your own academic work.

It is tempting to get everything else out of the way first, in a given day, week, month, etc., before beginning your research. Resist this temptation. It is much better to give yourself a little time more often, than to save up a block of time for your academic work. When that block arrives you will not know where to start, you will make disappointing progress, and you will become frustrated and disheartened. As a guideline, you ought to maintain the equivalent of at least one full day per week available for academic research. This may be made up of a few hours here or there, or of one clear day, if necessary at the weekend. More is great, but if you drop below this then it is unlikely you will make progress. On the other hand, if you maintain this level of work, then when a block of time does open up for you, you will be well-placed to take full advantage of it, and your project will leap forward.

Because academic work is difficult, you should make efforts to give it “quality” time. Save other work for the time when you are exhausted and half-asleep, or distracted. Exactly when you are at your best will depend on your personal work style.

Finally, despite this emphasis on time-management, you must not rush your work. You are engaged on a process of learning and intellectual growth. That growth takes time, and requires you to spend long hours thinking hard and apparently getting nowhere. If you give yourself the time and space to spend in this way, it will bear fruit in the end.

If you follow the following two simple rules you will avoid the most common time management problems.

1. Submit written work to your supervisor at least once per month from the outset of your degree.
2. Set aside the equivalent of at least one full day per week for your academic work (it may be a whole day, or the equivalent in chunks).
6. HOW TO REQUEST A LETTER OF REFERENCE FROM OUR LECTURERS

Requesting a reference – You MUST

(a) You must actually ask the lecturer in question whether he or she is happy to give you a letter of reference. It’s an absolute NO NO to just give his or her name in your application, and then inform them.

(b) You need to do so well in advance – at least a few weeks before the reference is due. This may come as a surprise to you, but we actually have a lot on our hands. So if you need anything from us, you need to give us time.

Choose a referee – choose someone who knows you and thinks well of you

(c) You can’t ask someone who doesn’t know you and your work well. There is simply nothing they can say about you.

(d) Don’t ask someone who you feel doesn’t think much of you or of your work. It’s counterproductive for you to get a negative reference. Ask someone with whom you have a working relationship.

Once they agree

(e) IF they agree, then you must send them your CV and all materials that you are sending in for your application (proposal, motivation letter, everything). This allows the lecturer to gear her/his reference letter to the specific position you are applying for.

(f) Again, this needs to be done in good time, so that the lecturer actually has time to write you a good reference.

IV. ACADEMIC STAFF

DEVON BAILEY
GES Assistant Lecturer
MA (Philosophy) UJ

Devon is a second-year PhD candidate at the UJ Department of Philosophy. She holds the NIHSS Doctoral Scholarship award and specialises in tutor mentorship and teaching philosophy to non-philosophy students. As a dancer, Devon’s research is focused on aesthetics and the philosophy of dance. Her research interests include African philosophy, specifically aesthetics and personal identity, as well as feminist theory and neurophenomenology. She is particularly interested in identity and self-knowledge in an African context and approaches her writings on aesthetics from a predominantly African perspective.
Supervision areas

**Areas of specialization:** Philosophy of dance; aesthetics (especially phenomenological approaches, e.g. Sheets-Johnstone, Fraleigh, Pakes)

**Areas of competence:** African philosophy, focused on issues of personal identity; neurophenomenology.

---

**CATHERINE BOTHA**  
Associate Professor

PhD (Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands)

Catherine’s research is focused mainly on aesthetics, most especially the philosophy of dance. Her interest lies also in the phenomenological tradition and its precursors in the continental tradition (most especially the work of Nietzsche and Heidegger), and this is often the lens through which she approaches her writing in aesthetics. She is currently the co-secretary of the South African Centre for Phenomenology, and is also a registered ballet teacher of the Royal Academy of Dance. She offers free tuition in classical ballet to UJ students at the UJ Art Academy.

**Supervision topics:** Aesthetics; philosophy of art; nineteenth and twentieth century continental philosophy, esp, the work of Heidegger and Nietzsche; feminism; philosophy of mind; animal ethics; bioethics.

---

**ALEX BROADBENT**  
Professor and Dean of the Humanities

Professor Alex Broadbent is Executive Dean of the Faculty of Humanities at UJ, founding Director of the African Centre for Epistemology and Philosophy of Science, and Professor of Philosophy. Before joining UJ in 2011, he held various research, teaching and visiting positions at Cambridge, Vienna, Athens and Harvard. Alex is a philosopher of science, medicine and epidemiology, with particular interests in causal inference, explanation, and prediction. Alex is committed to finding philosophical problems in practical contexts, and to contributing something useful concerning them. In particular, he has been instrumental in establishing the philosophy of epidemiology as a distinct sub-discipline at the intersection of philosophy of medicine and science (his 2013 book *Philosophy of Epidemiology* was the first book-length treatment of the topic). He also works on the philosophy of law, and especially the use of scientific evidence in law.

Alex holds a B1 from the National Research Foundation of South Africa (2019-2025) and is an alumnus of the South African Young Academy of Sciences. He has published
over 25 articles in top international journals across three disciplines (philosophy, epidemiology, law). He has three monographs, the latest being *Philosophy of Medicine*, published in 2019 by Oxford University Press.

**CHAD HARRIS**

**Lecturer**

Dr Chad Harris joined the department at the beginning of 2014 as the recipient of a Global Excellence Scholarship. His PHD was on the philosophical dimension of the problem of external validity. He teaches a second year course on the History of Modern Philosophy, a course on business ethics for accountants and an Hons/MA course in Philosophy of Language.

**Supervision areas:**

- Philosophy of science (broadly), philosophy of economics, the problem of induction (and new riddle), forecasting and prediction, comparing African epistemology and scientific rationality alternatives (especially African) to mechanistic thinking.

**ADEMOLA FAYEMI**

**Postdoctoral Research Fellow**

Ademola Kazeem Fayemi’s areas of competencies and interests include Bioethics in Africa, Research Ethics, and African philosophy. He has B.A. (Hons.), M.A., and Ph.D. in Philosophy from Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye in 2004, 2007 and 2013, respectively. Ademola also has M.SC (Degree) in Bioethics from the consortium of Katholieke Universiteit, Leuven, Radboud University, Nijmegen and University of Padova, Italy in 2014.

**HENNIE LÖTTER**

**Professor**

Prof Lötter's research interests are in political philosophy and philosophy of science. He has just completed a long-term project on justice and poverty.

**Supervision areas:**

- political philosophy [especially issues of justice], philosophy of science, theories of truth, and environmental ethics.
DIMPHO TAKANE MAPONYA

GES Assistant Lecturer

BA (Hons) Philosophy (UJ)

Dimpho has recently been appointed as an assistant lecturer at UJ Philosophy. She has been tutoring philosophy for several years and was, for two years, appointed as a senior tutor. In 2017, she was a recipient of the Global Excellence Stature Scholarship. She was also awarded a Masters’ Fellowship in the 2017 Women in Science Award by the Department of Science and Technology. Dimpho’s research interests are in African philosophy, feminism, philosophy of race and, very broadly, decolonisation. She has, in her postgraduate studies, been working on African conceptions of personhood, gender as well as an analysis of African feminism(s).

Supervision Areas

At Honours level: African Philosophy, Feminism, Decolonisation and Philosophy of race.

ERASMUS MASITERA

Post-doctoral Research Fellow

Erasmus Masitera recently completed his Doctorate at the University of Pretoria. He is a Lecturer at the Great Zimbabwe University. He is also the editor of Power in Contemporary Zimbabwe (Routledge 2018), and his post-doctoral fellowship research is focused on publishing articles on undertaking land reform in the light of characteristically African values.

THADDEUS METZ

Distinguished Professor

Thaddeus Metz is Distinguished Professor (2015-2019). He writes on a variety of moral and political topics, including: what makes a life meaningful; normative issues in higher education; sub-Saharan morality analytically interpreted and applied to contemporary issues; comparative philosophy, especially between the African and Chinese traditions; the implications of human dignity for politics and law; and theoretical accounts of wisdom and of psychological health. Amongst his more than 200 publications are Jurisprudence in an African Context (Oxford University Press 2017) and Religion and the Meaning of Life (Cambridge University Press 2019).

Supervision areas:

Honours and Master’s level: anything in Western normative philosophy (value theory, meta-ethics, applied ethics, ethical theory, political/legal philosophy); most things in African, East Asian or Islamic normative philosophy.
Doctoral level: African normative philosophy; meaning in life and related values; theories of justice; philosophy of higher education.

VELI MITOVA
Associate Professor and Head of Department

Veli is the co-founder of the African Centre for Epistemology and Philosophy of Science, and the South African team leader for the US-based Templeton-funded Geography of Philosophy Project. She obtained her PhD from Cambridge, and her other degrees from Rhodes. Before joining the UJ philosophy team in 2015, she lectured and researched at Vienna University, the National Autonomous University of Mexico, and Rhodes University. Most of Veli’s work lies at the intersection of epistemology, metaethics and the philosophy of action. In the last few years she was writing a book on the nature of evidence, which got published by Cambridge University Press in 2017. She is now moving to the greener pastures of Epistemic Injustice under the auspices of a British Academy Newton Advanced Fellowship.

Supervision areas:

At PhD, MA, and Honours levels: Epistemology, Normative Epistemology, Metaethics, Practical Reason

At MA and Honours level: Philosophy of Mind, Philosophy of Race, Philosophy of Emotions, Philosophy of Language, Philosophy and Literature, Ethics, Metaphysics

ZINHLE MNCUBE
Lecturer

Zinhle’s research interests lie broadly in the philosophy of science, the philosophy of biology, and the philosophy of race. Her Honour’s research was on the biological basis of race and her Master's dissertation is on heritability and genetic causation. Zinhle lectures undergraduate courses in metaphysics and epistemology. She is also an Iris Marion Young Scholar and a Cornelius Golightly fellow. She is currently completing her PhD at the University of Cambridge.

Supervision areas (MA and Hons):

Philosophy of biology and philosophy of race
MATTHIAS PAUWELS
Postdoctoral Research Fellow

Matthias Pauwels is a cultural and political philosopher who joined the Department in 2017 as postdoctoral research fellow. He obtained his DPhil degree at the University of Pretoria with a thesis on the relation between aesthetics and politics in the work of contemporary French philosopher Jacques Rancière. He earned his BA and MA degrees in Philosophy at the Erasmus University Rotterdam and also holds a MSc degree in Architecture from the Catholic University of Leuven.

His research at the Department, supervised by Professor Johan Snyman and Prof Catherine Botha, focuses on the entanglements of aesthetics and politics in the South African ‘postcolony’ and the ensuing conceptual intricacies, challenges and debates. More generally, his broad research interests include contemporary radical political philosophy (Rancière, Badiou, Negri, Žižek, Jameson), the Frankfurt School, Lacanian psychoanalytic theory, political aesthetics, contemporary political art practices (postconceptual, relational, activist), as well as African political philosophy and philosophies of liberation and decolonization.

Previously he has worked in the Netherlands for many years where he co-founded and ran the independent theoretical research office BAVO. Key publications here are the two edited volumes Cultural Activism Today. The Art of Over-Identification (2007) and Urban Politics Now. Re-Imagining Democracy in the Neoliberal City (2007), as well as the monograph Too Active to Act. Cultural Activism after the End of History (2010).

ASHEEL SINGH
Lecturer

Dr Asheel Singh’s research areas include applied ethics, with a specific focus on bioethics. He has lectured at the University of Zululand, and tutored several philosophy modules at UJ. In 2014, he was the recipient of the UJ Graduate Student Essay Prize (now known as the Lembede Essay Prize) for excellence in philosophical writing. His doctoral thesis awarded in 2019 brings together theories of meaning in life, dignity, anti-natalism, and transhumanism in an effort to better understand our ethical obligations to future generations.

Supervision areas (Hons and MA):

Various issues in applied ethics, including bioethics (transhumanism and the ethics of human enhancement), environmental ethics (animal rights, ethics of eating meat), and population ethics (anti-natalism); normative ethics, with a particular interest in deontology, virtue ethics, and various Eastern approaches (including Buddhist ethics); meaning in life
BEN SMART

Senior Lecturer

Ben is a senior lecturer in philosophy. Prior to joining the University of Johannesburg in 2015 he lectured at The University of Birmingham (in the United Kingdom). He received his PhD from Nottingham University in 2012. Ben’s research focuses on the metaphysics of laws and causation, and on the philosophy of medicine. He published a monograph entitled 'Concepts and Causes in the Philosophy of Disease' in 2016, and has numerous papers in highly ranked international philosophy journals. He has published articles on the metaphysics of least action principles, the problem of induction, the nature of fundamental properties, the philosophy of sport, and on the philosophy of health and disease. Ben believes that philosophical work in medicine can have a direct impact on society, and so also collaborates with academics in the medical sciences to address what some might call 'real world problems' in public health.

Supervision areas:

At all levels: Metaphysics and concepts of Causation, Metaphysics and concepts of Laws, Philosophy of Health, Disease, and Medicine, Philosophy of Epidemiology

At MA and Hons level: Philosophy of Sport, Mereology, Philosophy of Science broadly construed

RAFAEL WINKLER

Associate Professor


Supervision areas:

19th and 20th century European philosophy, German idealism, phenomenology, hermeneutics, poststructuralism, early modern philosophy, Kant, Hegel, Husserl, Heidegger, Levinas, Derrida, Nietzsche, Foucault, Aristotle, Bergson.
VI. POLICY: STUDENT PLAGIARISM

Version of 23 May 2013 (pending Senate approval)

1 PREAMBLE

- In pursuit of its vision of being an international university of choice, anchored in Africa, dynamically shaping the future;
- mindful of its commitment to the sustained excellence and relevance of its comprehensive programmes and of its research, and
- recognising its obligation to cultivate students with integrity, who are knowledgeable, well-balanced, ethical leaders and confident global citizens,

the University of Johannesburg ("the University") provides a uniform framework for dealing with student plagiarism.

2 PURPOSE

The purposes of this Policy are to record the principles that underpin the University’s approach to student plagiarism, the processes it applies when student plagiarism is detected and the responses of the University to student plagiarism.

3 SCOPE

This Policy covers plagiarism by students pursuing studies for any programme of the University (subsidised and non-subsidised, undergraduate and postgraduate) across all campuses of the University by any faculty, department or other structure.

4 DEFINITIONS

For the purpose of this Policy, unless otherwise stated or the context otherwise indicates, the following definitions apply:

4.1 Plagiarism

Passing off ideas however expressed, including in the form of phrases, words, images, artefacts, sounds, or other intellectual or artistic outputs, as one’s own when they are not one’s own; or

such passing off of ideas that are one’s own but have been expressed on a previous occasion for assessment by any academic institution or in any published form, without acknowledgement of the previous expression.
4.2 Reportable plagiarism

Plagiarism that:
(a) vitiates the attempt fairly and meaningfully to assess and, where relevant, assign a mark, grade, or other outcome to the work in question; and
(b) is such that an educational response (which may include capping or prescribing a mark) is inappropriate and that a formal academic response or a disciplinary response is appropriate, given the plagiarism history of the student, the nature and extent of the plagiarism, the level of the student, and all the other relevant circumstances of the case –
is deemed by the individual academic staff member in question to be reportable, having regard to the nature of the offence, the plagiarism history of the student, the possibility or probability of repeat offence, and all the other circumstances of the case.

4.3 Plagiarism Register

A central record of all cases of reported plagiarism that:
(a) includes the name and student number of the student, date of offence, details of offence and outcome of the relevant formal academic response or disciplinary procedure, and the name of the Head of Department reporting the offence;
(b) is held centrally to enable inter-Faculty detection of repeat offences; and
(c) is accessible by all academic members of staff in respect of the students they teach.

4.4 The Policy

The Policy: Student Plagiarism

4.5 Faculty Plagiarism Committee

The structure of the Faculty that deals with student plagiarism in a particular case

5 PRINCIPLES

5.1 The acceptable level of plagiarism at the University of Johannesburg is zero.

5.2 No case of reportable plagiarism shall go without a formal response.

5.3 Responsibility for understanding and avoiding plagiarism lies with the student, and therefore ignorance is not necessarily a defence against plagiarism. The ability to recognise and avoid plagiarism is an academic skill which, like other academic skills and knowledge, students are expected to master. As for other academic skills and knowledge, students are expected to evince clearer
understanding of plagiarism as they progress through the years of education, and failure to progress in this regard will affect their academic record.

5.3 The University and its students have a reciprocal responsibility on the one hand to educate and on the other to learn about plagiarism. The University has a responsibility to take steps to ensure that students understand what plagiarism is and how to avoid it, and students have a responsibility actively to apply themselves in this regard.

5.4 By the definition thereof in Paragraph 4.1, plagiarism does not require intent, but intent is one factor that may be considered when deciding on the reportability of a case of plagiarism or on the appropriate response to a case of reportable plagiarism.

5.5 By the definition thereof in paragraph 4.2, the judgement as to whether reportable plagiarism has occurred is an academic judgement, since it depends on whether the work can be fairly and meaningfully assessed, and on whether an educational response would be inappropriate. As such it may have discipline-specific aspects, and the responsibility for making the judgement lies in the first instance with the academic(s) assessing the work in question.

5.6 The response to reportable plagiarism is not a matter of academic judgement and is prescribed by the relevant academic or disciplinary body, which will be either the Faculty Plagiarism Committee or the Student Disciplinary Committee respectively, depending on the case.

5.7 Plagiarism can most effectively be eliminated at the outset of a student’s academic career, and the consequences of early leniency can be severe later. Although the level of the student may be taken into account in considering the appropriate response, it is only one among other factors. Thus the level of a student is not necessarily a defence against any given response, and all responses are in principle available at all levels.

5.8 The relevant Department, Faculty Plagiarism Committee (if involved) and Student Disciplinary Committee (if involved) must deal with cases of reportable plagiarism timeously, efficiently, fairly, and without consequences or threat of consequences for the staff member(s) reporting the plagiarism.

6 PROCEDURES

6.1 Where an academic, in consultation with Departmental colleagues (including the Head of Department), decides that a case of plagiarism is reportable, s/he refers it to the Plagiarism Committee (or the appropriate structure) of the relevant Faculty.
6.2 Upon considering the documentary evidence, the Faculty Plagiarism Committee must:

6.2.1 upon confirming the Department’s finding that a case of reportable plagiarism has occurred, pursuant to the principle set out in Paragraph 5.2, respond in accordance with Paragraph 7 of the Policy; or

6.2.2 upon disconfirming the Department’s finding that a case of reportable plagiarism has occurred, refer the case back to the Department, for a response in accordance with Paragraph 8 of the Policy.

6.3 Where the Faculty Plagiarism Committee deems appropriate a response that includes a penalty that it does not have the authority to enforce, it shall enforce whatever part of the response lies within its authority, and refer the case to the Student Disciplinary Committee. The Faculty Plagiarism Committee may recommend a penalty to the Student Disciplinary Committee.

6.4 Upon receiving a recommendation from a Faculty Plagiarism Committee, the Student Disciplinary Committee shall administer the case as a disciplinary matter in accordance with its procedures, including where appropriate a hearing with a right to legal representation. Nothing in this Policy detracts from the discretion of the Student Disciplinary Committee to impose any penalty within its jurisdiction that it considers appropriate, including penalties in accordance with Paragraph 7 of the Policy.

7 RESPONSES TO REPORTABLE PLAGIARISM

7.1 In deciding upon a response for a given case the following factors must be considered:

7.1.1 the plagiarism history of the student, the response identified for a case with this history in paragraphs 7.2.1, 7.2.2, 7.2.3 or 7.2.4 of this Policy, and any previous educational responses, formal academic responses or disciplinary penalties imposed upon the student for plagiarism or other academic misconduct;

7.1.2 the level of the student, to the extent that it bears on whether the student can be expected to have understood and avoided the plagiarism that has occurred;

7.1.3 the extent of the plagiarism;

7.1.4 the nature of the plagiarism, to the extent that it bears on whether the student can be expected to have understood or avoided plagiarism of this nature;

7.1.5 the degree of intent or of recklessness, neither of which is necessary for plagiarism in accordance with Paragraph 5.4 of the Policy but which may compound or mitigate the offence, or necessitate further action beyond
the scope of this Policy, especially where criminal activities are suspected;
7.1.6 consistency with existing practice and previous decisions within the Faculty and University;
7.1.7 the recommendation of other committees or academic staff involved in the case;
7.1.8 any other relevant circumstances of the case.

7.2 Reportable plagiarism shall result in:
7.2.1 in the first instance by that student, a mark of zero for the assignment or work in question (which is a response that can arise from assessment and thus falls within the Faculty Plagiarism Committee’s powers), whether or not this leads to further natural consequences, such as the student not obtaining the minimum module mark to gain entrance to the examination, or the student obtaining a failing mark for the module or degree in question; or

7.2.2 in the second instance by that student –
(a) a mark of zero for the assignment or work in question (which is a response that can arise from assessment and thus falls within the Faculty Plagiarism Committee’s powers), that may result in the student not obtaining the minimum module mark to gain entrance to the examination, or the student obtaining a failing mark for the module or degree in question, or
(b) deregistration from a module, or
(c) cancellation of a mark or result, or
(d) any combination of these; or

7.7

7.2.3 in the third instance by that student, suspension for one full academic year; or
7.2.4 in the fourth instance by that student, expulsion; or
7.2.5 where, considering all the circumstances of the case, the Committee deems the responses indicated in Paragraphs 7.2.1 to 7.2.4 to be inappropriate or inadequate, any other response the Committee deems appropriate considering the factors set out in Paragraph 7.1.

7.3 Recognising that the nature and correct treatment of plagiarism may vary between academic disciplines, in interpreting the Policy each Faculty shall establish its own guidelines and practices so as to ensure fairness and consistency in responding to plagiarism, consistent with the principles set out in Paragraph 5 of the Policy.
8 RESPONSES TO NON-REPORTABLE PLAGIARISM

8.1 Where a case of plagiarism is not reportable, responsibility lies with the Department to determine the appropriate educational response, which may or may not include capping or prescribing a mark.

8.2 An educational response would normally be appropriate where:

8.2.1 it is not clear whether plagiarism has occurred but a response is nevertheless appropriate; or

8.2.2 the plagiarism is not such as to vitiate the attempt to meaningfully assess the piece; or

8.2.3 the plagiarism arises from poor referencing; or

8.2.4 the student has been inadequately prepared to avoid plagiarism; or

8.2.5 any combination of the foregoing situations listed in this subparagraph arise; or

8.2.6 any other situation arises in which the Department deems that an educational response is appropriate.

8.3 Educational responses include:

8.3.1 explaining the nature of the apparent plagiarism; or

8.3.2 allowing the student to eliminate the apparent plagiarism and resubmit the piece; or

8.3.3 capping the mark for that assignment at a certain level, e.g. 50% or zero; or

8.3.4 any combination of the foregoing responses listed in this subparagraph; or

8.3.5 any other response that the Department deems educationally appropriate.

8.4 Each Department shall establish its own guidelines and practices so as to ensure fairness, consistency and adherence to the principles set out in Paragraph 5 of the Policy in the implementation of educational responses.
9 DUTIES OF ACADEMIC STAFF

9.1 While the responsibility for avoiding plagiarism remains entirely with the student, the Policy imposes a duty on academic staff to be vigilant for plagiarism whenever considering students’ work and especially on any occasion where work is assessed.

9.2 The Policy recognises that academic members of staff exercise academic judgement as to whether a detected case of plagiarism is reportable, and have a duty to report all cases of plagiarism that they deem to be reportable.

9.3 No method for detecting plagiarism is prescribed by the Policy. However, the use of electronic resources is strongly encouraged, and supervisors must ensure that appropriate use of these resources is made by Master’s and doctoral students prior to submission for assessment.

9.4 The Policy imposes a duty on academic staff, Departments, and Faculties to ensure that adequate measures to enable students to understand and avoid plagiarism are in place, such that:
   9.4.1 an adequate measure is one that is reasonable to expect will enable a student of that level to recognise and avoid plagiarism; and
   9.4.2 adequacy is not assessed by whether any given student in fact does recognise and avoid plagiarism; and
   9.4.3 adequate measures may take into account the level of the student, so that at more senior levels, students can be reasonably expected to understand plagiarism to a greater degree already, and adequate measures may be correspondingly less thorough.

9.5 The duties imposed in this paragraph:
   9.5.1 are duties imposed by the University on its academic staff; and
   9.5.2 are duties owed to the University, not to any student(s); and
   9.5.3 where they are not discharged, constitute a matter between the University and the staff member(s) involved, and do not constitute any defence to students accused of plagiarism; and
   9.5.4 do not supplement or replace the factors listed in Paragraph 7 and 8 to be considered in assessing the appropriate response to a case of plagiarism.

10 APPEALS

10.1 An appeal against a finding or penalty imposed by the Student Disciplinary Committee is through the usual channels for appeals against decisions of the Student Disciplinary Committee.
10.2 An appeal against a finding of reportable plagiarism or associated response by a Faculty Plagiarism Committee is in writing to the Executive Dean of the Faculty, who shall treat it as an appeal against an academic decision.

10.3 An appeal against a finding of non-reportable plagiarism or associated response by a Department is in writing to the Executive Dean of the relevant Faculty, who may take advice from the Faculty Plagiarism Committee, as s/he sees fit.

11 COMMENCEMENT, REPEAL AND TRANSITIONAL MATTERS

11.1 The Policy will come into operation when it is approved by all the relevant structures of the University.

11.2 The Policy replaces the Plagiarism Policy approved by Senate on 17 July 2008, which will continue to govern plagiarism in respect of work submitted prior to the commencement of the Policy.