

MSc in CRIMINOLOGY and CRIMINAL JUSTICE

REPORT OF THE EXAMINERS 2011

General Remarks

The Chair of Examiners would like to thank all of those involved in the examination process for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice; those who served on the Board of Examiners, those who acted as Assessors, the Director of Examinations (Grant Lamond) and the Examinations Officer (Julie Bass) - who were available throughout the year for support and advice. Dedicated administrative support was received from the Criminology Graduate Studies Administrator, Ms Iris Geens.

The Board of Examiners was supported for a second and final year by Professor Benjamin Bowling from King's College, London, who was enormously helpful in reading and commenting on essays, dissertations and examination scripts. The Board records its thanks to Professor Bowling for his assistance.

Structure of the Examination

The structure of the examination had changed from the previous year. The elements of the examination were as follows:

- **Option essays:** In each of Michaelmas and Hilary Terms, students were required to take *two* optional seminar-based courses (out of a choice of five in each term). In Trinity Term, students were required to take *one* of a choice of four optional seminar-based courses. All optional courses were examined by essays, the titles of which were posted at noon on Friday of Week 6, and the essays submitted by noon on Friday of Week 9. Each essay, with the exception of the two methods option courses (Social Explanation and Data Analysis and Qualitative Methods) was to be no less than 3,500 and no more than 5,000 words. In all options the candidates chose one essay question from a choice of three. The two methods options were assessed in the same way except that the essays were to be no less than 2,500 words and no more than 3,000 words and the candidates had to complete a number of assignments during the first six weeks of term, marked on a pass/fail basis, to the satisfaction of the course tutor.
- **Research Design and Data Collection 'in term' essays:** This new component of the course is a compulsory research methods course for all students to take in Michaelmas Term. It was examined by two essays of 1,500-2,000-words, to be submitted by Wednesday Week 5 and Friday Week 6 respectively. Each essay question was released 1.5 weeks before the submission deadline.

- **Examination:** Students were required to take two Core Courses; 'Explanation and Understanding in Criminology' in Michaelmas Term, and 'Understanding Criminal Justice' in Hilary Term. These two courses were examined by one unseen three-hour written paper on the Wednesday of Week 0 of Trinity Term (Wednesday 27 April 2011). Students were required to answer three questions from a choice of twelve; at least one of which was to be answered from each of the two parts of the exam paper.
- **Dissertation:** The students were required to submit a Dissertation of no less than 8,000 and no more than 10,000 words by noon on Friday of Week 9 of Trinity Term.

To pass the Examination

The degree of MSc is awarded to any candidate who achieves a mark of at least 50 per cent for (a) the five options and the 'Research Design and Data Collection' course, (b) the core course exam paper, and (c) the dissertation; and, in the case of candidates who have taken Social Explanation and Data Analysis and/or Qualitative Methods, have also satisfactorily completed the form of continuous assessment required for the relevant option. For this purpose, the individual marks of the five assessed essays and the average mark for the two pieces of coursework for 'Research Design and Data Collection', are aggregated and an average mark awarded for the assessments as a whole. The examiners award a distinction to any candidate who achieves marks of at least 70 per cent on at least six of the papers and, in the case of candidates who have taken 'Social Explanation and Data Analysis' and/or 'Qualitative Methods', have also satisfactorily completed the form of continuous assessment required for the relevant option): in this calculation, both the core course exam and the dissertation count as two papers and each assessed essay and the average mark for the two pieces of coursework for 'Research Design and Data Collection', counts as one.

Information given to candidates

The Edict and one Supplementary Edict (attached at Appendix 1) were sent out to candidates in Michaelmas Term 2010 and Hilary Term 2011 respectively in hard and electronic copy. The Edict was also available on the MSc Criminology intranet pages. Much of this information had already been available to candidates in the MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice handbook, and the programme specifications (all students received a hard copy of these documents upon enrolment and they are also available on the intranet).

Marking

All 'Research Design and Data Collection' essays, option essays, dissertations and core course examination papers were double-blind marked by two Examiners, or an Examiner and an Assessor, who then met to agree a mark (see Appendix 1, which contains the marking conventions at Appendix B and the Assessment Standards at Appendix C). In nearly all cases there was no substantial difference between the initial grades and so agreement was easily reached.

Following the Faculty of Law guidelines, a representative selection of coursework was sent to the External Examiner following the sampling method that was devised with his approval: from every course the External Examiner would receive one essay in the 50-59% range, one in the 60-69% range and one in the 69+ range. As a result, the maximum amount of essays he would receive per course was three. For courses where there is no essay in one or more of these range(s) he would receive fewer essays. The essays are selected at random, although care is taken that there is a spread of essays

across all students as well as marks within the ranges. All papers with a mark of 49% or below are sent to the External Examiner for review. During 2010-2011 there was one such paper. Altogether the External Examiner read 51 assessments (34 essays, three Core Course examinations and four Dissertations).

Procedures and Problems

During the academic year under review, the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice and the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice (Research Methods) together received many submissions to the Proctors under *Examinations Regulations*, Regulations for the Conduct of University Examinations, Part 11, clauses 11.8 to 11.10. Such submissions are made “[i]f it comes to the notice of a candidate’s college before, during or after an examination that the candidate’s performance in any part of a University Examination is likely to be or has been affected by factors of which the examiners have no knowledge” (Examination Regulations 2010, p 34) and, when approved by the proctors, allow the Board of Examiners to take “such action as the Examiners may think suitable”. In total there were five such submissions in relation to three individual candidates, posing a not inconsiderable administrative burden. These submissions were discussed by the Board in some detail and judgements made about the candidates’ results.

Plagiarism checks

This was the fifth year of routine plagiarism checks in criminology. This year the plagiarism checks were extended to include dissertations, as well as assessed essays. Candidates were warned in the Graduate Student Handbook, in the Edicts, and at a plagiarism seminar as well as at a seminar on writing skills for assessments, that a random sample of essays and dissertations would be checked for plagiarism. Accordingly, they were asked to submit electronically a copy of each of their essays and of their dissertation to the Graduate Studies Administrator at the same time as they submitted a hard copy to the Examination Schools. Using the system of selecting a random sample of assessments and checking a selection of paragraphs and phrases using ‘Google’, developed and first used in 2006-2007, first assessors for each essay and for the dissertations checked a third of the submitted assessments, drawn randomly by the Chair of Examiners. This year this process revealed no cases of plagiarism.

The ‘random sampling process’ and subsequent correspondence between the administrator, Chair of Examiners and the assessors represented an extra administrative task. However, given the size of the sample, this was manageable.

The Centre for Criminology currently does not use software for checking plagiarism. Turnitin—one such software—had become available during the academic year 2008-2009 but the Criminology Board of Examiners confirmed in its meeting of 21 July 2009 that it was not an efficient and appropriate resource for the Masters programme. The Criminology Board of Studies will however keep the current system and periodically review this decision, in light of the experience of the Law Faculty for other postgraduate courses.

Medical certificates and other information about factors affecting performance

During the academic year under review the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice, and the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice (Research Methods) together had five candidates registered with the Disability Advisory Service for disability-related matters. These all received special arrangements for assessments to compensate for their disabilities, as follows:

- Three candidates received an extra 10 minutes per hour and access to a word processor for their Core Course Examination in Trinity Term.
- Two candidates received an extra 10 minutes per hour for their Core Course Examination in Trinity Term.

Moreover, the two MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice programmes together saw an unusually large number of submissions to the Proctors for extensions to submission deadlines, all of which were granted. In total, eleven such permissions were made for eight individual candidates. These extensions were requested (and all granted) for a variety of reasons (health, disability, personal and work-related reasons).

- One candidate received extensions for their assessments in Hilary and Trinity Term due to the continuous ill health caused by their disability.
- One candidate received an extension for their two Hilary Term essays due to unavoidable urgent work-related reasons.
- One candidate received an extension for a Hilary Term essay due to illness.
- One candidate received an extension for both of their Hilary Term essays due to sudden illness.
- One candidate received an extension for their Trinity Term assessed essay and dissertation due to health issues.
- One candidate was allowed to sit their statistics examination at a later date as a 'first sit' (not a resit) due to personal issues preventing the candidate from sitting the examination at the original date.
- One candidate received an extension for their Trinity Term assessed essay and dissertation due to continued personal issues.
- One candidate received an extension for their Trinity Term assessed essays and the dissertation to be written over the summer, due to health issues.
(These last two candidates' issues continued over the summer leading to their dissertations remaining unfinished which takes their studies into the next academic year.)

As already indicated above, some of the candidates with special arrangements and extensions for their assessments also made submissions to the Proctors under *Examinations Regulations*, Regulations for the Conduct of University Examinations, Part 11, clauses 11.8 to 11.10.

Changes to the Examination Rubric

Changes enacted during 2010-2011

During the academic year 2009-2010 the Board of Studies proposed and approved two changes to examination procedures, both of which took effect from October 2010.

Plagiarism checks for dissertations

With the approval of Prof Dick Hobbs, the then External Examiner, the Board of Examiners had agreed to commence random plagiarism checks on dissertations – in addition to essays - from the Academic Year 2010-2011.

New compulsory component: Methods I: Research Design and Data Collection

The Divisional Report of 2008 recommended that the Centre make the Michaelmas Term research methods course *Research Design and Data Collection* compulsory for all MSc students, not just for the students on the Research Methods version of the course. In its response to the Division's recommendations, the Centre agreed to make this module compulsory, in addition to the two optional modules in Michaelmas Term. Given the increased workload, the Board of Studies decided to make changes to the number and nature of the assessments on this now compulsory course. Instead of two pieces of coursework handed in during term-time and assessed on a pass/fail basis, as well as a marked essay due in by Week 9, the course was to be assessed by means of two term-time assessments with a word limit of 1,500-2,000 words but no end-of-term assessed essay.

Change approved and enacted during 2010-2011

To facilitate the cataloguing of Masters dissertations by the Bodleian Social Science Library, students were required to submit with their dissertation a completed and signed copy of Form GSO.26b.

Changes approved during 2010-2011 for enacting during 2011-2012

During the academic year under review the Board of Studies proposed and approved two changes to examination procedures, both of which will take effect from October 2011.

Assessment change for Research Design and Data Collection

The assessment structure of 'Research Design and Data Collection' had been changed for 2010-2011 as this course had now become an extra compulsory component of the MSc course. The end-of-term assessed essay and series of term-time pass/fail assignments had been replaced by two (shorter) term-time assessments with a word limit of 1,500-2,000 words. Review of this new assessment structure showed that having two term-time formal assessments put students under considerable pressure and compromised their class attendance and participation levels. The Board of Studies therefore decided to change the assessment structure back to one term-time 2,000-2,500 word assignment (to be submitted by noon on Friday of Week 6 and assessed on a pass/fail basis) and one end-of-term 2,000-2,500-word assessed essay (to be submitted by noon on Friday of Week 9, with the choice of essay questions released by noon on Friday of Week 6).

Introduction of new option 'Statistical Methods for Social Scientists'

From the academic year 2011-2012, this course will be offered by the Centre for Criminology, replacing the statistics course offered to previous MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice (Research Methods) cohorts by the Department of Politics and International Relations. This new 'in-house' course will also be available as an option to the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice students.

Overall Results of the Examination

There were twenty candidates for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice. One candidate's studies will extend into the next academic year with late submission of the dissertation. All other candidates passed the degree; with two gaining a distinction. The only candidate with an average of over 70% (70.2%), with six components at distinction level, was awarded the Roger Hood Prize, designed to recognize the best performance on the MSc at distinction level. The recipient of the *proximae* prize obtained an overall distinction (with seven components at distinction level and a weighted average of 69.1%). Overall the performance of the candidates was very good. Attached at Appendix 2 is the numbers of entrants, passes, distinctions and fails, broken down by gender, as well as the range of marks for each component of the course.

Core course examination

Twenty three students sat the exam, which had two sections, each comprising six questions. Students had to answer at least one question from each section and a third one from either section. All questions were attempted by at least one student apart from B6 (on parole) which no-one answered. Only one student answered A5 (on emotions and law-breaking). Marks ranged from 52% to 74%. Four students were awarded distinction marks. 18 students were awarded marks in the 60s. One student was awarded 52%.

Optional Courses

Michaelmas Term

Research Design and Data Collection (Dr Jane Donoghue)

All MSc students (plus one DPhil student) completed the two essays for this compulsory option. One essay was on victim surveys and one essay was on research design. The quality of the answers was generally high. Very few students received marks of below 60% for either essay. No student received a mark below 59% in the first essay and 54% in the second essay. There were three distinctions in the first essay and four distinctions in the second essay. These students all demonstrated excellent skills in independent critical analysis and evaluation of research. Overall, students demonstrated breadth and depth of understanding and the ability to select and engage with appropriate literature.

Prisons (Dr Mary Bosworth)

All the papers for the Prisons option passed. Marks ranged from 54% to 70%. One distinction was awarded. Students submitted essays addressing all three questions, though only one attempted the question on legitimacy.

Death Penalty (Dr Carolyn Hoyle)

Six students submitted assessed essays: all passed, one with distinction.

One candidate answered question 1 on the social, legal and political conditions that would need to be in place for America to abolish the death penalty over the next two or three decades. This was a reasonably high pass. It was strong on the politico-legal aspects, but less persuasive on the social factors conducive to abolition.

Three candidates answered question 2, about arbitrariness in the administration of the death penalty. One received a high pass for a wide ranging and thorough essay that was reasonably strong on both death penalty jurisprudence and the relevant social scientific evidence. The other two received distinctions for very sophisticated treatments of the question. These two papers were extremely well written.

Two candidates answered question 3 about progressive restriction of the death penalty. While the question asked them to consider one or two jurisdictions, both candidates chose to focus only on the US. They both received passes in the mid 60s and both would likely have received higher marks if they had discussed progressive restriction through limiting capital punishment to specific offences, rather than only discussing restriction through limiting it to certain (vulnerable) offenders. While their treatment of the restriction of the death penalty only to the most culpable offenders was good, the question invited consideration of states' abolition of capital punishment to the most serious offences.

All of the essay questions were cross-cutting, requiring students to draw on the literature from many weeks of the course. By and large all of students managed to do this, with those who reached a high pass or distinction doing it very well.

Restorative Justice (Dr Carolyn Hoyle)

Nine students submitted assessed essays.

Four students answered the first question about the relationship between retributive and restorative justice and all passed. All papers were reasonably strong on the theoretical debates within the literature about whether restorative justice should be conceived of as punishment and the extent to which retribution and restoration were diametrically opposed. One received a low pass as it was not so well developed or articulated and had a number of errors of syntax.

Four students answered the second question about whether it is unrealistic to attempt to use restorative processes in cases where there is a significant imbalance of power between the parties. All four papers were awarded mid-high passes. All papers would have benefited – to a greater or lesser extent - from closer proofreading and one in particular was not as coherent as it needed to be.

One student answered the third question based on Chris Cunneen's criticisms of restorative justice. This candidate was awarded a distinction for a theoretically sophisticated, wide-ranging and beautifully written paper, which went beyond both the literature and the issues discussed in class.

All of the essay questions were, to a greater or lesser extent, cross-cutting, requiring students to draw on the literature from more than one week of the course. Most students achieved this.

Human Rights and Criminal Justice (Prof Andrew Ashworth / Dr Liora Lazarus)

Eight candidates submitted Human Rights assessed essays. Seven of them chose the same title, which required them to examine the reasoning in the recent judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in the case of *Gaefgen v. Germany*. This is a case with poignant facts which raises some fundamental issues of human rights and, because the judgment was only recently handed down, there is very little published commentary for candidates to refer to. The better candidates sought to place the judgment in its

context as well as examining its internal logic, one candidate producing a truly outstanding essay and two others writing very good essays. Beneath those there were essays that did not really go far enough in either of those directions, although in almost all cases the candidates showed a pleasing understanding of the general issues. One candidate tackled a general question about the jurisprudence of the Strasbourg court, with moderate success.

Crime and the Family (Dr Rachel Condry)

Eleven candidates were assessed in this course. Students were able to choose one from three questions; one candidate attempted question 1; five attempted question 2; and five attempted question 3. The mark range spanned 55% to 75%. Two candidates were awarded distinction marks (75% and 70%) and two were marked in the fifties (55% and 56%). The rest of the marks ranged from 62% to 67%.

Hilary Term

Crime, Political Ideologies and Political Culture (Prof Ian Loader)

11 students sat this paper. Four students answered the question asking whether private security can be legitimate. Five students answered the question about whether it is possible, or desirable, to insulate crime control policy from democratic politics. Only one student answered the question about whether 'governing through crime' threaten[s] the 'principal values of both conservatives and liberals' (Simon, 2007: 278). Most marks ranged in the 60s. Two students obtained marks in the 50s and two students obtained a distinction (70% and 75%). The lowest mark was 55% and the highest 75%.

Qualitative Research Methods (Dr Mary Bosworth)

The essays for Qualitative Methods were of a consistently good standard. Distinction marks were agreed for two papers - the rest, other than one 'pass' fell into the strong pass category. Most students elected to design a research proposal, with two students selecting essay question 3 (According to Alison Liebling in *What is Criminology?* (2011: 528), "Social science research aims to provide authentic description, understanding and explanation of social phenomena." To what extent can qualitative methods help researchers achieve these goals?) and only one selecting essay question 2 (Critically assess the author's account of his research methods in the following article: Andrew Goldsmith (2003). "Fear, Fumbling and Frustration: Reflections on Doing Criminological Fieldwork in Colombia", *Criminal Justice*. 3(1): 103-125.).

Social Explanation and Data Analysis (Dr Rachel Condry)

Of the seven essays submitted, five answered the question about narrative analysis and two answered the question about integrating macro and micro analyses. It is unclear why there were no essays answering the first question about the epistemological assumptions underlying statistical analysis - it may be that this question was perceived to be harder than the others, or that the students chose the topics in which they had most interest. Overall, the standard was high, with all marks in the range 60%-74%. There were four distinctions, ranging between 70% and 74%.

Sentencing (Prof Andrew Ashworth / Prof Julian Roberts)

Of the 10 essays, six answered the first title on mandatory minimum sentences, one answered the second title on comparisons between guideline systems, and three

answered the third title on the sentencing of young offenders. Candidates generally demonstrated good research and good familiarity with the main arguments relevant to their question. The three candidates who were awarded distinction marks excelled in the structure and clarity of their essays, and particularly in the persuasiveness of their arguments based on the sources cited. The other essays were of a good standard, but did not achieve the same high level of reasoning and argument.

Victims (Dr Carolyn Hoyle)

Nine candidates were examined for the Victims Option. One candidate answered question 2 on the benefits and pitfalls of victim and community participation in criminal justice, one answered question 3 on the helpfulness of the victim labelling for deciding how society should respond to the harms caused by crime, and the rest answered question 1 on the rights of vulnerable people in the criminal process. Almost all the papers showed thorough research, with candidates drawing on a wide range of academic literature, legislation and case law and with most going beyond the prescribed course readings. A few papers were marked down for sloppy writing, with typographical mistakes and errors of syntax. Further, some students would have gained higher marks for a better structure and for being more careful in their referencing. A couple of students made unsubstantiated assertions that either did not make sense or, more typically, did not have authoritative references for them. The main error made by many candidates who answered question one was a failure adequately to develop a position on rights. Too many answers to this question dealt well with the 'needs' or vulnerable people in the system, but did not grapple with the problematic nature of rights, especially victims' rights. There is a literature on this in the course and students should have been well prepared to engage with this.

Trinity Term

Risk, Security and Criminal Justice (Prof Lucia Zedner)

Nine candidates took this option. All candidates answered the second or third questions (with candidates being almost equally divided between the two). No candidate attempted the first question. One candidate who submitted a poorly written and substantively weak paper received the agreed (fail) mark of 30%.

All other essays were of a variable standard. The weaker essays did not engage adequately with the readings set and some relied heavily on readings outside the course list to the exclusion of the course list itself. Other common weaknesses included insufficient engagement with leading debates in the area, poor organization, and, in a couple of cases, a failure to address the question adequately.

The better essays engaged much more effectively with the literature, advanced a clear line of argument within a clear overall structure, and attempted to answer the question directly. These essays made good use of the readings set, demonstrated a strong grasp of factual detail, and, where relevant, made effective reference to recent legal developments to substantiate their answers. The very best essays provided sophisticated answers to the question and made a sustained attempt to advance a plausible argument or set of arguments. They benefitted from clear organization, were engaging to read, and demonstrated an impressive grasp of the issues in play.

Sociology of Punishment (Dr Mary Bosworth)

All papers were good; with one awarded a distinction. Four of the students answered question 2 on how useful the notion of 'culture' and/or 'power' is in explaining punishment, and two answered question 3 on whether penal populism is inevitable. No-one answered question 1 (Critically assess David Garland's claim that (1991: 120), a 'sociological approach to punishment is not just an academic enthusiasm or a theoretical exercise without any practical payoff. [...]).

Comparative Criminal Justice (Prof David Nelken, Prof Nicola Lacey and Dr Liora Lazarus)

There were five candidates and three essay questions. All three questions were tackled. Two candidates answered the question on ethnocentrism and comparative research, two tackled the question on universalism and variation in human rights protection and one addressed the question on structure, culture and punitiveness. The answers were generally very good, showing full understanding of the ideas discussed in class and the recommended texts but also bringing in outside reading. One essay showed poor reasoning powers in parts and was marked down for this.

Youth Justice (Dr Jane Donoghue)

Student performance on this course was, overall, very good. The students' assessed work demonstrated a good and, in some cases, a sophisticated understanding of the course themes and issues. Although there were no distinctions, no student failed their essay. All but one student achieved a mark of over 60, and the majority achieved a strong pass.

Dissertations

One candidate will submit their dissertation in the next academic year following several submissions to the Proctors Office. Two candidates submitted their dissertations a few weeks late, with agreement from the Proctors. All others submitted on time.

The range of topics was wide and interesting. All candidates presented well-researched and well-written papers. All passed, with five obtaining distinctions. No student was awarded a grade in the 50s, with the lowest mark being 61%. The distinctions were characterized by extensive reading, effective engagement with the research literature, and a clear ability to mount, sustain, and substantiate a coherent argument.

B. Bowling (External)
C. Hoyle (Chair)
I. Loader
R. Condry
28 September 2011

**IMPORTANT – TO BE RETAINED FOR FUTURE
REFERENCE**

**FACULTY OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD**

**MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice
NOTICE AND SUPPLEMENTARY NOTICE
TO CANDIDATES 2010-2011**

This document (traditionally known as the Examiners' Edict) is the means by which the Examiners communicate to the candidates information about the assessment and examination process. It is very important that you should read it carefully and retain this copy for future reference. A copy is also to be found on the Centre for Criminology website at <http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/MSC/generalinformation.htm>. If you believe that it may contain an error, please notify the Chair of Examiners (Dr Carolyn Hoyle) without delay.

Examination Entry details – the Examination Schools will inform you that your options have been entered into the examination system. Compulsory papers will automatically be attached to your academic record on registration. It is **your responsibility to ensure your examination entry details are correct** via the Student Self Service in OSS. See <http://www.ox.ac.uk/students/studentselfservice/>.

A. Information for Candidates regarding the Assessed Essays for Options

1. Timing

Michaelmas Term 2010

Friday 19th November 2010 (Noon): Essay titles shall be posted on the Graduate Student Noticeboard at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by e-mail.

Friday 10th December 2010 (Noon): Candidates must submit the required work to the Clerk of Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

Hilary Term 2011

Friday 25th February 2011 (Noon): Essay titles shall be posted on the Graduate Student Noticeboard at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by email.

Friday 18th March 2011 (Noon): Candidates must submit the required work to the Clerk of the Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

Trinity Term 2011

Friday 10th June 2011 (Noon): Essay titles shall be posted on the Graduate Student Noticeboard at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by email.

Friday 1st July 2011 (Noon): Candidates must submit the required work to the Clerk of the Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

2. Method of Assessment

All options (other than ‘Methods II: Social Explanation and Data Analysis’ and ‘Qualitative Methods’) shall be examined by means of an assessed essay of 3,500 – 5,000 words (*inclusive of footnotes, but excluding bibliography and appendices*). A selection of three titles will be given from which students must choose one. For Marking Conventions see **Appendix B** and for Assessment Standards see **Appendix C** attached.

Both ‘Methods II: Social Explanation and Data Analysis’ and ‘Qualitative Methods’ are examined by means of an assessed essay of no less than 2,500 and no more than 3,000 words (*inclusive of footnotes, but excluding bibliography and appendices*). For each of these two options a selection of three titles will be given, from which students must choose one. In addition, candidates taking either or both of these two options shall be required to complete to the satisfaction of the option course leader any assessments set during the term, which will be approved by the Board of Studies and the details of which will be given to the students at the start of the term.

3. Submission of Written Work

Candidates shall be required to submit **two typewritten copies** of each essay. Assessed essays must be typed or printed on one side of A4 paper only, with a margin of 3 to 3.5 centimetres on the left-hand side of each page. The text should be double-spaced and the footnotes and quotations should be single-spaced. Pages should be numbered and **EACH page should record your examination number, the option title and the essay question title in a header or footer box**. Candidates must **not** write their name or College anywhere on the essays or envelopes. Essays should be bound or stapled, not held together by a paper clip. All written work must be submitted in English.

Each essay should have a cover sheet attached to it containing the title and examination number. It should also state the Oxford term and year of submission and the number of words (*inclusive of footnotes, but excluding bibliography and appendices*). You will find copies of these cover sheets for your use on the MSc website: <http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/MSC/generalinformation.htm>. In addition, each essay must be accompanied by a declaration that ‘This essay is the candidate’s own work. No part of it has already been accepted, nor has it been currently submitted, for a degree of this University or elsewhere.’ To assist you, this declaration has been incorporated into the **Declaration of Authorship** you are required to submit (see further A.5. below). Late submission of this Declaration may lead the Proctors’ Office to recommend an academic penalty (see Examination Regulations 2010, pages 46-47, Part 16.8.(6)).

Two copies of each of the essays must be delivered in separate envelopes to the Clerk of Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford. Each envelope should be addressed to:

“The Chair of Examiners for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice,
c/o The Clerk of Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford”

In the bottom left-hand corner of the envelope you should print “Assessed Essay for the [name of option] for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice”; and your examination number should be printed in the top right hand corner of the envelope.

At the same time as you submit a hard copy to the Examination Schools, you must also submit electronically a copy of each essay to the Graduate Studies Administrator (email: iris.geens@crim.ox.ac.uk) for the Examiners. A random sample of essays will be checked for plagiarism (see further A.5. below).

Application to the Proctors for permission for late submission of essays should be made by the candidate’s college, on the candidate’s behalf, before the submission date. Written work submitted late (even 10 minutes past the deadline) will not be released to the Examiners, but will be held by the Examination Schools and the Proctors will be informed. The candidate’s college, on the candidate’s behalf, may write to the Proctors explaining the reason for late submission. The Proctors may permit the candidate to remain in the examination and to submit the work late, but will impose a late presentation fee (to cover administrative costs). In addition, the Proctors may give leave to the Examiners to impose an academic penalty, which will take the form of a reduction in the mark by up to one class (or its equivalent). In determining the amount of the reduction, the Examiners will be guided by the evidence forwarded to them by the Proctors and (insofar as the following matters are dealt with by such evidence):

- (1) the degree of advantage gained by the extra time made available to the candidate relative to the time that was available to complete the assessed essays by the original deadline;
- (2) the weight to be attached to the excuse given, if any, for late submission;
- (3) the candidate’s performance in the assessed essays submitted late relative to his or her performance in the assessed essays submitted by the deadline, the Core Course examination paper and the dissertation;
- (4) the effect of any proposed reduction on the candidate’s degree result as a whole.

Factors (2) – (4) may require a final decision on penalty to be delayed until all the marks for the degree examination are known. See further Examination Regulations 2010, pp. 46-47, para. 16.8. Candidates should consult their College Advisor if any of these provisions apply to them. See also Section B.5 below (third paragraph).

A candidate who fails to apply for or to obtain permission from the Proctors for the late submission of any assessed essays, or non-submission (i.e. withdrawal from this examination unit (see Section B.5. below)), will be deemed to have failed the entire degree examination (not just the assessed essays unit). Non-submission includes where the Examiners refuse to examine work which exceeds the word limit (see Section A.4. below).

4. Length

Candidates should take seriously the word limits imposed (both upper and lower). If a candidate exceeds the word limit, the examiners may decide not to proceed with the examination of the work. If they do proceed, they may reduce the mark by up to one class (or its equivalent). See further Examination Regulations 2010, pp. 44-45, para. 16.6.

5. Plagiarism

Plagiarism is “the wrongful appropriation or purloining, and publication as one’s own, of the ideas, or the expression of the ideas of another” (OED). All published and unpublished material, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, is covered under this description. The Proctors’ Disciplinary Regulations concerning conduct in examinations (see Examination Regulations 2010, Part 19.4. and 19.5, p. 52) state that ‘No candidate shall present for an examination as his or her own work any part of the substance of another person’s work. In any written work (whether thesis, dissertation, essay, coursework, or written examination) passages quoted or closely paraphrased from another person’s work must be identified as quotations or paraphrases, and the source of the quoted or paraphrased material must be clearly acknowledged.’ In all written work students must be vigilant in citing the work they have referred to or quoted from. (Please see further **Appendix D**). Examples of plagiarism and detailed advice as to how to avoid it are given on <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/epsc/plagiarism/index.shtml>; you are strongly advised to consult this website. Academic supervisors can provide practical guidance on providing references and bibliographies for your work. The University reserves the right to use software applications to screen any individual’s submitted work for matches either to published sources or to other submitted work. Any such matches respectively might indicate either plagiarism or collusion. In this connection, you are required to complete and submit with each essay a **Declaration of Authorship**, including acknowledgement of the University’s right to check for plagiarism or collusion. A blank Declaration of Authorship for your use is on the MSc website: <http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/MSC/generalinformation.htm>.

Candidates are also reminded to abide by the declaration they are required to make upon submitting the essays namely: ‘This essay is the candidate’s own work. No part of it has already been accepted, nor has it been currently submitted, for a degree of this University or elsewhere.’ For convenience, this declaration has been incorporated into the **Declaration of Authorship**.

Late submission of this Declaration may lead the Proctors’ Office to recommend an academic penalty (see Examination Regulations 2010, pages 46-47, Part 16.8.(6)).

Candidates are warned that each term a random sample of submitted work is subject to plagiarism checks and they may be penalized if they are found guilty of plagiarism, which includes substantial use of the same material in more than one essay or in the dissertation.

6. Results

The Examiners hope to be able to publish the results of the Michaelmas Term essays by Friday 21st January 2011, the results of the Hilary Term essays by Thursday 5th May 2011

and the results of the Trinity Term essays by Friday 22nd July 2011 (i.e. the date upon which the Final Results are to be published).

B. Information for Candidates regarding the Core Course Examination

1. Time of Examination

This year the MSc written examination for the Joint Core Course ‘Explanation and Understanding in Criminology and Understanding Criminal Justice’ is scheduled to take place in Week 0 of Trinity Term, provisionally on **Wednesday 27th April 2011**. The date and time will be confirmed in the Examination Timetable, to be published online at <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/schools/oxonly/timetables/index.shtml>, no later than five weeks prior to the examination. Hard copies of each candidate's personal timetable will be sent to their college by the Examination Schools shortly after the full timetable appears on the website.

2. Place of Examinations and Time of Arrival

The Examination will take place in the Examinations Schools in the High Street. *Subfusc.* must be worn. You are advised to reach the Schools no less than ten minutes before the stated time of the examination. A bell will be rung some minutes before the Examination to give candidates time to move from the entrance of the building to the Examination Room. Notices in the Schools will direct candidates to the appropriate room. Seating in the examination room will be by desk number only. Seating charts will be displayed throughout the Examination Schools reception areas in each examination location, displaying candidate and desk numbers, as well as outside individual examination rooms. The Examination Schools will send you an individual timetable listing your candidate number and the time and dates of the examination. This will be sent to you no later than two weeks before the examination begins. Please bring this note with you to the examination room or devise some way of remembering your examination number. Please also bring with you your University Card; this must be placed face up on the desk at which you are writing.”

3. Materials in the Examination Room

(i) Reference materials

No books, papers or dictionaries may be taken into the examination room.

(ii) Rough work

If you wish to write plans or rough drafts, you may do this either in the same booklet as your answers (but cross out the rough work) or in a separate booklet (indicating that this is rough work) which must be handed in along with your answer booklets.

(iii) Water and medication

Candidates are allowed to take into examination rooms (a) water in a spill proof bottle (not screw top bottles and (b) certain prescription medications and/or conventional medical treatments (for asthma and Type 1 diabetes).”

4. Scripts

(i) Anonymity

The Examination is marked anonymously. Candidates must write their EXAMINATION NUMBER ONLY in the appropriate place in each answer book they use. Candidates must not write their name or college on any scripts, even if an answer book contains a box labelled "name and college" (that box must be left blank).

(ii) Legibility

Candidates must not write in pencil. Candidates submitting illegible scripts will be required to have them typed after the examination, under invigilation, at their own expense.

(iii) Handing in scripts

It is **the candidate's responsibility** to place their scripts in the box corresponding to their examination number before leaving the examination room. Any candidate who does not hand in a script **must** inform an invigilator.

5. Leaving the examination room and failing to hand in any written work on time

No candidate may leave the Examination Room within half an hour of the beginning of the Examination and, to avoid disturbance to other candidates, candidates may not leave the Examination Room within half an hour of the end of the Examination. For further details, see the Examination Protocol at **Appendix A**.

A candidate who is taken ill while sitting a written paper may (with an invigilator's permission) leave the room and return while the examination is in progress to resume the paper on one occasion only (and no extra time shall be allowed). If the candidate is unable to complete the paper concerned because they have been taken ill a second time, they should inform an invigilator so that the incomplete script can be handed in. It is the candidate's responsibility to obtain a medical certificate explaining how their performance in the paper concerned may have been affected by illness. The Examiners will only be made aware of any difficulties suffered by a candidate in the examination room if the candidate subsequently obtains a medical certificate and that, plus any other relevant information, is submitted to the Proctors and passed by them to the Examiners. For the procedures to be followed see paragraph B.10 below.

Candidates who fail to attend a written examination paper without having obtained the prior permission of the Proctors are deemed to have failed the entire examination (not just that particular unit of the examination) unless the Proctors give instructions to the Examiners about reinstating them (Examination Regulations 2010, pp. 39-40, Part 14). This means that the names of such candidates have to be included on the results list under 'fail'. For the procedure for late submission and the consequences of failure to hand in written work, see Section A.3 above (assessed essays) and Section C.4. below (dissertation). For the procedures for withdrawal (from the entire examination and a particular unit of the examination) before the examination and after the examination has started, see the Examination Regulations 2010, pp. 39-40, Part 14. A candidate may not withdraw from the examination after the written part of the entire examination is

complete. The point of completion is deemed to be the conclusion of the last paper for which the candidate has entered, or the time by which a dissertation or other written material is due to be submitted, whichever is the later.

6. Special remarks concerning the paper

There will be twelve questions on the Core Course paper, which is divided into two sections. Candidates must answer THREE questions, at least one from each section.

7. Marking

It is essential that candidates follow the instructions on the paper. Failure to do so will result in a penalty. Failure to answer fully any question or questions will constitute short weight and will lead to a reduction in the overall mark. For Marking Conventions see **Appendix B** and for Assessment Standards see **Appendix C** attached.

8. Results

The Core Course paper will be marked, alongside the Trinity Term essays and the Dissertation, in June. The Examiners hope to be able to publish the results by Friday 22nd July 2011.

9. Protocol

The Examination Protocol (**Appendix A**) gives practical guidance on the conduct of the examination. A copy of the Protocol is appended and you should read it before the day of the examination. Please note, this document will not be placed on desks in the examination room. The Protocol also refers you to the Proctors' Disciplinary Regulations and Administrative Regulations for Candidates in Examinations (See also Section E below.)

10. Illness or other Causes affecting Candidates for Examinations

The Proctors have authority to authorise special arrangements for candidates who for medical or other sufficient reasons are likely to have difficulty in writing their scripts or completing the examination in the time allowed. Such arrangements must be made **by Friday 5th November 2010 (Week 4, Michaelmas Term)**. If this applies, you should consult the appropriate college officer, usually the Senior Tutor. Where a candidate's performance in any part of an examination is likely to be, or has been, affected by factors such as illness or disability, of which the Examiners have no knowledge, the candidate may, through the appropriate college officer, inform the Proctors of these factors, and the Proctors will pass this information to the Chair of Examiners if, in their opinion, it is likely to assist the Examiners in the performance of their duties. Candidates are advised to check with the appropriate college officer that any medical certificate for submission is complete (eg covers each paper where the candidate was affected by illness). See further the Examination Regulations 2010, pp. 32–35, part 11. The Examiners cannot take account of any special circumstances other than those communicated by the Proctors. See also Section B.5 above.

C. Information for Candidates regarding the Dissertation

1. Timing

Hilary Term

Wednesday 23rd February 2011 (noon): Candidates must submit the title of their proposed dissertation to the Graduate Studies Administrator by email.

Friday 11th March 2011: Candidates will be informed by this date whether their titles have been approved and will be given the name of their Dissertation Supervisor.

Trinity Term

Friday 1st July 2011 (Noon): Candidates must submit the Dissertation to the Clerk of the Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

2. Change of Title

A request to change the title agreed by the Examiners must be approved by the Dissertation Supervisor and the Chair of Examiners. See further the Examination Regulations 2010, pp. 44-45, para. 16.6.

3. Method of Assessment

The Dissertation shall be between **8,000 and 10,000 words** (*inclusive of footnotes and appendices, but excluding the abstract, table of contents, table of cases, table of statutes, the bibliography, any headers and footers and index*). The Dissertation title must be approved by the Board of Examiners (see timetable above). For Marking Conventions see **Appendix B** and for Assessment Standards see **Appendix C** attached.

4. Submission of Dissertation

Candidates shall be required to submit **two typewritten copies** of the Dissertation. The Dissertation must be typed or printed on one side of A4 paper only, with a margin of 3 to 3.5 centimeters on the left-hand side of each page. The text should be double-spaced and the footnotes and quotations should be single-spaced. Pages should be numbered and **EACH page should record your examination number and the dissertation title in a header or footer box**. Candidates must **not** write their name or College anywhere on the Dissertation or envelope. The Dissertation should be bound or stapled, not held together by a paper clip. All written work must be submitted in English. For definitive guidance on the correct format for a dissertation please refer to **Appendix E**, and see also Section 7.7 of the Graduate Student Handbook 2010-2011 for further details.

The Dissertation should have a cover sheet attached to it containing the title, subtitle (if any) and examination number. It should also state the Oxford term and year of submission and the number of words (inclusive of footnotes and appendices, but excluding the abstract, table of contents, table of cases, table of statutes, the bibliography,

any headers and footers and index). You will find copies of these cover sheets for your use on the MSc website: <http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/MSC/generalinformation.htm>. In addition, the Dissertation must be accompanied by a declaration that ‘This Dissertation is the candidate’s own work. No part of it has already been accepted, nor has it been currently submitted, for a degree of this University or elsewhere.’ To assist you, this declaration has been incorporated into the **Declaration of Authorship** you are required to submit (see further C.6. below). Late submission of this Declaration may lead the Proctors’ Office to recommend an academic penalty (see Examination Regulations 2010, pages 46-47, Part 16.8.(6)).

Two copies of the Dissertation must be delivered in separate envelopes to the Clerk of Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford. Each envelope should be addressed to:

“The Chair of Examiners for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice,
c/o The Clerk of Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford”

At the same time as you submit a hard copy to the Examination Schools, you must also submit electronically a copy of each dissertation to the Graduate Studies Administrator (email: iris.geens@crim.ox.ac.uk) for the Examiners. A random sample of dissertations will be checked for plagiarism (see further A.5. below).

In the bottom left-hand corner of the envelope you should print “Dissertation for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice”; and, your examination number should be printed in the top right hand corner of the envelope.

Application to the Proctors for permission for late submission of the dissertation should be made by the candidate’s college, on the candidate’s behalf, before the submission date. Written work submitted late (even 10 minutes past the deadline) will not be released to the Examiners, but will be held by the Examination Schools and the Proctors informed. The candidate’s college, on the candidate’s behalf, may write to the Proctors explaining the reason for the late submission. The Proctors may permit the candidate to remain in the examination and to submit the work late, but will impose a late presentation fee (to cover administrative costs). In addition, the Proctors may give leave to the Examiners to impose an academic penalty, which will take the form of a reduction in the mark by up to one class (or its equivalent). In determining the amount of the reduction, the Examiners will be guided by the evidence forwarded to them by the Proctors and (insofar as the following matters are dealt with by such evidence):

- (1) the degree of advantage gained by the extra time made available to the candidate relative to the time that was available to complete the dissertation by the original deadline;
- (2) the weight to be attached to the excuse given, if any, for late submission;
- (3) the candidate’s performance in the thesis or other exercise relative to his or her performance in written papers or other exercises;
- (4) the effect of any proposed reduction on the candidate’s degree result as a whole.

See further Examination Regulations 2010, pp. 46-47, para. 16.8. Candidates should consult their College Advisor if any of these provisions apply to them. See also Section B.5. above (third paragraph).

A candidate who fails to apply for or to obtain permission from the Proctors for the late submission of the dissertation, or non-submission (i.e. withdrawal from this examination unit (see Section B.5. above)), will be deemed to have failed the entire degree examination (not just the dissertation unit). Non-submission includes where the Examiners refuse to examine work which exceeds the word limit (see Section C.5. below) or where the title is different from that agreed by the Examiners (see Section C.2 above).

5. Length

Candidates should take seriously the word limits imposed (both upper and lower). If a candidate exceeds the word limit, the examiners may decide not to proceed with the examination of the work. If they do proceed, they may reduce the mark by up to one class (or its equivalent). See further Examination Regulations 2010, pp. 44-45 para. 16.6.

6. Plagiarism

Plagiarism is “the wrongful appropriation or purloining, and publication as one’s own, of the ideas, or the expression of the ideas of another” (OED). All published and unpublished material, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, is covered under this description. The Proctors’ Disciplinary Regulations concerning conduct in examinations (see Examination Regulations 2010, Part 19.4 and 19.5. p. 52) state that ‘No candidate shall present for an examination as his or her own work any part of the substance of another person’s work. In any written work (whether thesis, dissertation, essay, coursework, or written examination) passages quoted or closely paraphrased from another person’s work must be identified as quotations or paraphrases, and the source of the quoted or paraphrased material must be clearly acknowledged.’ In all written work students must be vigilant in citing the work they have referred to or quoted from (please see further **Appendix D**). Examples of plagiarism and detailed advice as to how to avoid it are given on <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/epsc/plagiarism/index.shtml>; you are strongly advised to consult this website. Academic supervisors can provide practical guidance on providing references and bibliographies for your work. The University reserves the right to use software applications to screen any individual’s submitted work for matches either to published sources or to other submitted work. In this connection, you are required to complete and submit with the Dissertation a **Declaration of Authorship**, including acknowledgement of the University’s right to check for plagiarism or collusion. A blank Declaration of Authorship for your use is on the MSc website: <http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/MSC/generalinformation.htm>.

Candidates are also reminded to abide by the declaration they are required to make upon submitting the dissertation namely:

‘This dissertation is the candidate’s own work. No part of it has already been accepted, nor has it been currently submitted, for a degree of this University or elsewhere.’ To assist you, this declaration has been incorporated into the **Declaration of Authorship**.

Late submission of this Declaration may lead the Proctors’ Office to recommend an academic penalty (see Examination Regulations 2010, pages 46-47, Part 16.8.(6)).

Candidates should stand forewarned that they may be penalized if they use substantially the same material in their dissertation as they have used in an assessed essay.

7. Results

The Examiners hope to be able to publish the dissertation results by Friday 22nd July 2011 (i.e. the date upon which the Final Results are provisionally due to be published).

D. Information for Candidates regarding ‘Methods I: Research Design and Data Collection’

1. Method of Assessment

‘Methods I: Research Design and Data Collection’ shall be examined by means of two term-time assessed essays of 1,500 – 2,000 words each (*inclusive of footnotes, but excluding bibliography and appendices*). For Marking Conventions see **Appendix B** and for Assessment Standards see **Appendix C** attached.

2. Timing of Assessments

Friday 29 October 2011 (3pm): Essay title for the first assignment shall be announced to candidates in class by the course tutor; it will also be posted on the Graduate Student Noticeboard at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by e-mail.

Tuesday 9 November 2011 (Noon): Candidates must submit the required work to the Centre for Criminology’s Graduate Studies Administrator.

Friday 5 November 2011 (3pm): Essay title for the second assignment shall be announced to candidates in class by the course tutor; it will also be posted on the Graduate Student Noticeboard at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by e-mail.

Friday 19 November 2011 (Noon): Candidates must submit the required work to the Centre for Criminology’s Graduate Studies Administrator.

3. Submission of Written Work

Candidates shall be required to submit **two typewritten copies** of each essay. Assessed essays must be typed or printed on one side of A4 paper only, with a margin of 3 to 3.5 centimetres on the left-hand side of each page. The text should be double-spaced and the footnotes and quotations should be single-spaced. Pages should be numbered and **EACH page should record your examination number, the course title and the essay question title in a header or footer box**. Candidates must **not** write their name or College anywhere on the essays or envelopes. Essays should be bound or stapled, not held together by a paper clip. All written work must be submitted in English.

Each essay should have a cover sheet attached to it containing the title and examination number. It should also state the Oxford term and year of submission and the number of words (inclusive of footnotes, but excluding bibliography and appendices). You will find copies of these cover sheets for your use on the MSc website: <http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/MSC/generalinformation.htm>. In addition, each essay must be accompanied by a declaration that ‘This essay is the candidate’s own work. No part of it has already been accepted, nor has it been currently submitted, for a degree of this University or elsewhere.’ To assist you, this declaration has been incorporated into the **Declaration of Authorship** you are required to submit (see further A.5. below). Late submission of this Declaration may lead the Proctors’ Office to recommend an academic penalty (see Examination Regulations 2010, pages 46-47, Part 16.8.(6)).

Two copies of each of the assessed essays must be delivered in separate envelopes to the Centre for Criminology’s Graduate Studies Administrator. Each envelope should have the following information on it, and it should be addressed to:

**“The Chairman of Examiners for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice/ MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice (Research Methods),
C/o Graduate Studies Administrator, Centre for Criminology, Manor Road Building”**

In the bottom left-hand corner of the envelope you should print **“Assessment for ‘Methods I: Research Design and Data Collection’ for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice/ MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice (Research Methods)”**; your candidate number should be printed in the top right hand corner of the envelope.

At the same time as you submit a hard copy to the Examination Schools, you must also submit electronically a copy of each essay to the Graduate Studies Administrator (email: iris.geens@crim.ox.ac.uk) for the Examiners. A random sample of essays will be checked for plagiarism (see further A.5. below).

Application to the Proctors for permission for late submission of essays should be made by the candidate’s college, on the candidate’s behalf, before the submission date. Written work submitted late (even 10 minutes past the deadline) will not be released to the Examiners, but will be held by the Examination Schools and the Proctors will be informed. The candidate’s college, on the candidate’s behalf, may write to the Proctors explaining the reason for late submission. The Proctors may permit the candidate to remain in the examination and to submit the work late, but will impose a late presentation fee (to cover administrative costs). In addition, the Proctors may give leave to the Examiners to impose an academic penalty, which will take the form of a reduction in the mark by up to one class (or its equivalent). In determining the amount of the reduction, the Examiners will be guided by the evidence forwarded to them by the Proctors and (insofar as the following matters are dealt with by such evidence):

- (5) the degree of advantage gained by the extra time made available to the candidate relative to the time that was available to complete the assessed essays by the original deadline;
- (6) the weight to be attached to the excuse given, if any, for late submission;
- (7) the candidate’s performance in the assessed essays submitted late relative to his or her performance in the assessed essays submitted by the deadline, the Core Course examination paper and the dissertation;
- (8) the effect of any proposed reduction on the candidate’s degree result as a whole.

Factors (2) – (4) may require a final decision on penalty to be delayed until all the marks for the degree examination are known. See further Examination Regulations 2010, pp. 46-47, para. 16.8. Candidates should consult their College Adviser if any of these provisions apply to them. See also Section B.5 below (third paragraph).

A candidate who fails to apply for or to obtain permission from the Proctors for the late submission of any assessed essays, or non-submission (i.e. withdrawal from this examination unit (see Section B.5. below)), will be deemed to have failed the entire degree examination (not just the assessed essays unit). Non-submission includes where the Examiners refuse to examine work which exceeds the word limit (see Section A.4. below).

4. Length

Candidates should take seriously the word limits imposed (both upper and lower). If a candidate exceeds the word limit, the examiners may decide not to proceed with the examination of the work. If they do proceed, they may reduce the mark by up to one class (or its equivalent). See further Examination Regulations 2010, pp. 44-45, para. 16.6.

5. Plagiarism

Plagiarism is “the wrongful appropriation or purloining, and publication as one’s own, of the ideas, or the expression of the ideas of another” (OED). All published and unpublished material, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, is covered under this description. The Proctors’ Disciplinary Regulations concerning conduct in examinations (see Examination Regulations 2010, Part 19.4. and 19.5, p. 52) state that ‘No candidate shall present for an examination as his or her own work any part of the substance of another person’s work. In any written work (whether thesis, dissertation, essay, coursework, or written examination) passages quoted or closely paraphrased from another person’s work must be identified as quotations or paraphrases, and the source of the quoted or paraphrased material must be clearly acknowledged.’ In all written work students must be vigilant in citing the work they have referred to or quoted from. (Please see further **Appendix D**). Examples of plagiarism and detailed advice as to how to avoid it are given on <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/epsc/plagiarism/index.shtml>; you are strongly advised to consult this website. Academic supervisors can provide practical guidance on providing references and bibliographies for your work. The University reserves the right to use software applications to screen any individual’s submitted work for matches either to published sources or to other submitted work. Any such matches respectively might indicate either plagiarism or collusion. In this connection, you are required to complete and submit with each essay a **Declaration of Authorship**, including acknowledgement of the University’s right to check for plagiarism or collusion. A blank Declaration of Authorship for your use is on the MSc website: <http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/MSC/generalinformation.htm>.

Candidates are also reminded to abide by the declaration they are required to make upon submitting the essays namely: ‘This essay is the candidate’s own work. No part of it has already been accepted, nor has it been currently submitted, for a degree of this University

or elsewhere.’ For convenience, this declaration has been incorporated into the **Declaration of Authorship**.

Late submission of this Declaration may lead the Proctors’ Office to recommend an academic penalty (see Examination Regulations 2010, pages 46-47, Part 16.8.(6)).

Candidates are warned that each term a random sample of submitted work is subject to plagiarism checks and they may be penalized if they are found guilty of plagiarism, which includes substantial use of the same material in more than one essay or in the dissertation.

6. Results

The Examiners hope to be able to publish the results of the Michaelmas Term essays by Friday 21st January 2011.

D. Overall Assessment and Publication of Results

The degree of MSc shall be awarded to any candidate who achieves a mark of at least 50 per cent for (a) the five options and the ‘Research Design and Data Collection’ course, (b) the core course paper, and (c) the dissertation, and, in the case of candidates who have taken Social Explanation and Data Analysis and/or Qualitative Methods, have also satisfactorily completed the form of continuous assessment required for the relevant option. For this purpose, the individual marks of the five assessed essays and the average mark for the two pieces of coursework for ‘Research Design and Data Collection’, will be aggregated and an average mark awarded for the assessments as a whole. The examiners award a distinction to any candidate who achieves marks of at least 70 per cent on at least six of the papers and, in the case of candidates who have taken ‘Social Explanation and Data Analysis’ and/or ‘Qualitative Methods’, have also satisfactorily completed the form of continuous assessment required for the relevant option): in this calculation, both the core course and the dissertation shall count as two papers and each assessed essay and the average mark for the two pieces of coursework for ‘Research Design and Data Collection’, shall count as one.

The Examiners hope to publish the final results by Friday 22nd July 2011. Once the results have been released online, candidates will be sent an automatic e-mail to say their results are available to view. Candidates can then access their results via their Student Self Service. The Academic and Assessment Results page within Student Self Service details all assessment results (examination papers and/or submissions) and the final classification (if applicable) on this page. For further information candidates are referred to <http://www.ox.ac.uk/students/studentselfservice/>. Informal individual transcripts (giving the breakdown of marks) will be mailed direct to candidates at their colleges once the final marks are published.

F. Proctors’ and Assessor’s Memorandum

Essential Information for Students (known as the Proctors’ and Assessor’s Memorandum) contains much useful information and is available on <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/proctors/pam/index.shtml> Sections 9, 10, 11 and 13 have relevance for examinations.

B. Bowling (External Examiner)

C. Hoyle (Chair)

R. Condry

I. Loader

29 September 2010 (original notice to candidates)

January 2011 (supplementary notice to candidates)

Appendix A

MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice 2010-2011

EXAMINATION PROTOCOL

NB This is an unofficial practical guide to conduct and procedures in the Examination Schools. In addition, you should before the examination familiarize yourself with the Proctors' Disciplinary Regulations for Candidates in Examinations (see Examination Regulations 2010, Part 19, pages 51-53) **and the Proctors' Administrative Regulations for Candidates in Examinations** (see Examination Regulations 2010, Part 20, pages 53-54).

1. Please check that you are seated at the right seat in the examination room.
2. In order to prevent impersonation of examination candidates, during every written paper you must display your University Card face up on the desk at which you are writing.
3. Do not turn over the examination paper or begin writing until you are told you may do so.
4. You may remove gowns, jackets and ties during the examination, but you must be correctly dressed in *subfusc*. before you leave the examination room.
5. Do not put your name or college on any answer book. Write only "MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice", the title of the paper ("Core Course") and your examination number in the spaces provided.
6. Please read the instructions on the front of your answer book and observe them.
7. You may not leave the examination room before 30 minutes after the beginning of the examination, nor in the last 30 minutes of the examination.
8. Do not bring refreshments into the examination room. Water is available in the lobby just outside the room. It is not to be brought into the room. If you would like a drink of water or to visit the lavatory please contact one of the invigilators by raising your hand.
9. Do not bring mobile telephones or any other electronic devices into the examination room.
10. Do not bring any papers, dictionaries or personal belongings, such as coats and bags, into the examination room. All articles or equipment to be used in an examination must be carried into the examination room in a transparent bag. Non-transparent bags must be offered for inspection and, unless special permission is given by an invigilator, must be deposited at the place designated for the deposit of bags and other personal belongings.
11. If you require more paper, raise your hand (preferably with a piece of paper in it) and it will be brought to you.

12. Shortly before the end of the examination, you will be given an oral notice of the time remaining. At the end of the examination you will be orally notified to stop writing. If you have used more than one answer book, you must tag the books together using the tag provided.

13. At the end of the examination, you will be called upon, a row at a time, to deposit your script in the boxes provided.

14. At the end of the examination, please go directly to your college. In order to avoid nuisance to other members of the public, the Proctors' rules clearly prohibit you from assembling for any purpose in the entrance of the Examination Schools or on the streets outside. The Proctors' Code of Conduct for post-examination celebrations is available on <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/proctors>.

Appendix B

MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice 2010-2011

MARKING CONVENTIONS

1. It is important to appreciate that the classification conventions set out here are not inflexible rules. The examiners retain discretion in dealing with unusual cases and circumstances. Subject to that caveat, the conventions that will normally be applied are as follows.

2. The University requires scripts to be marked on a scale from 1 to 100. Marks of 70 and above are Distinction marks and marks of 50 to 69 are pass marks. Marks of 49 or below are fail marks.

(a) The degree of MSc is awarded to any candidate who achieves a mark of at least 50 per cent for (a) the assessed essays (b) the core course paper and (c) the dissertation. For this purpose, the individual marks of the five assessed essays are aggregated, and an average mark awarded for the assessed essays as a whole.

(b) The examiners award a Distinction to any candidate who achieves marks of 70 per cent or more on at least six of the papers. In this calculation, both the core course and the dissertation count as two.

(c) In the Core Course Examination, a mark will be given for each question out of 100 and the total divided by three to achieve the mark for that paper. A paper will be deemed not to have been fully answered if a whole question has been omitted, or, where part of a question is separately numbered or lettered, part of a question has been completely omitted. The precise degree of the penalty incurred will depend upon the extent to which the script is short weight. For example, If a candidate completes two questions marked at 70 and 70 in a paper which requires 3 answers, the overall mark is recorded as '70/2' ('70 over 2 answers', to indicate the extent of the short weight relative to the requirements of the paper) and 13 marks deducted, making a total overall mark of 57 for the script. If a candidate completes two-and-a-half questions marked at 70, 70 and '70/ ½' ('70 over half an answer') in a paper which requires 3 answers, the overall mark is recorded as '70/ 2 ½ ' ('70 over 2 ½ answers', to indicate the extent of the short weight relative to the requirements of the paper) and 7 marks deducted, making a total overall mark of 63 for the script.

Appendix C

MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice 2010-2011

Assessment Standards

70-100: Distinction level

Papers which are awarded a distinction will be well structured, well argued and comprehensive. They will be analytical, rather than merely descriptive and will go beyond the most obvious sources of knowledge. The candidate will have demonstrated an unusually clear grasp of most of the issues (including all the more important ones), used an unusually wide range of material, and displayed very good skills in evaluating the material and using it to construct arguments which deal with the issues.

- 80-100: Superb work showing fine command of intellectual debates and making a creative contribution to them.
- 75-79: Excellent work, intellectually stimulating argument.
- 70-74: Fine work showing powerful analysis, a distinctive argument, and full awareness of the secondary literature and critical engagement with it.

50-69: Pass

Papers which are awarded a pass mark will demonstrate a competent grasp of most of the more important issues, a familiarity with and understanding of a reasonable range of relevant materials, and good skills in evaluating the material and using it to construct arguments which deal with the issues.

- 65-69: Strong pass: Strong and well-developed independent critical analysis that moves beyond issues discussed in seminars. Clear and logical arguments and an awareness of nuances and complexities in debates. Strong evidence of independent research drawing on a wide range of literature. Some indication of distinction potential; no significant errors of fact or interpretation.
- 55-64: Good pass: Sound analytical standard with most points developed rather than stated. Some evidence of independent critical analysis and evaluation and synthesis of material. Addresses the question and provides a reasonably focused answer. Some awareness of nuances and complexities in debates.
- 50-54: Pass: Basic analytical skills apparent from identification of intellectual problems with some structured discussion of them. Partially addresses the question but lacks focus. Broadly satisfactory grasp of key issues. Arguments appropriate, but underdeveloped.

Candidates are expected to pay attention to academic style, grammar, use of referencing and citation conventions as these will be taken into account in the assessment process.

0-49: Fail

An unsatisfactory piece of work. At best, the answer will simply describe the most relevant research and debates but will not demonstrate any skill at analysis or argumentation. It is likely that this candidate will not have clearly demonstrated much understanding of the question or the issues it raises. Some of the most relevant material is likely to have been ignored and irrelevant material included.

45-49: Marginal fail: inadequate development of points made.

0-44: Outright fail: inadequate coverage and inadequate analysis.

‘Methods I: Research Design and Data Collection’ and ‘Methods II: Social Explanation and Data Analysis’, ‘Qualitative Methods’

To pass these three methods options candidates must satisfactorily complete assignments during the term. A satisfactorily completed assignment is one that demonstrates the candidate's

- ability to follow accurately the procedures required for the project, as set out in the assignment instructions
- understanding of the processes involved in the project
- ability to write a sensible, accurate and illuminating report on the outcomes
- diligent application to the assignment.

A candidate will not fail an assignment solely on the ground that the results obtained in the course of the project are incorrect.

Appendix D

Academic Integrity: good practice in citation and the avoidance of plagiarism

What is plagiarism?

Plagiarism is the copying or paraphrasing of other people's work or ideas into your own work without full acknowledgement. All published and unpublished material, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, is covered under this definition. Collusion is another form of plagiarism involving the unauthorised collaboration of students (or others) in a piece of work. Cases of suspected plagiarism in assessed work are investigated under the disciplinary regulations (<http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/proctors/info/pam/section9.shtml>) concerning conduct in examinations. Intentional or reckless plagiarism may incur severe penalties, including failure of your degree or expulsion from the university.

Why does plagiarism matter?

It would be wrong to describe plagiarism as only a minor form of cheating, or as merely a matter of academic etiquette. On the contrary, it is important to understand that plagiarism is a breach of academic integrity. It is a principle of intellectual honesty that all members of the academic community should acknowledge their debt to the originators of the ideas, words, and data which form the basis for their own work. Passing off another's work as your own is not only poor scholarship, but also means that you have failed to complete the learning process. Deliberate plagiarism is unethical and can have serious consequences for your future career; it also undermines the standards of your institution and of the degrees it issues.

What forms can plagiarism take?

- **Verbatim quotation of other people's intellectual work without clear acknowledgement.** Quotations must always be identified as such by the use of either quotation marks or indentation, with adequate citation. It must always be apparent to the reader which parts are your own independent work and where you have drawn on someone else's ideas and language.
- **Paraphrasing the work of others by altering a few words and changing their order, or by closely following the structure of their argument,** is plagiarism because you are deriving your words and ideas from their work without giving due acknowledgement. Even if you include a reference to the original author in your own text you are still creating a misleading impression that the paraphrased wording is entirely your own. It is better to write a brief summary of the author's overall argument in your own words than to paraphrase particular sections of his or her writing. This will ensure you have a genuine grasp of the argument and will avoid the difficulty of paraphrasing without plagiarising. You must also properly attribute all material you derive from lectures.
- **Cutting and pasting from the Internet.** Information derived from the Internet must be adequately referenced and included in the bibliography. It is important to evaluate

carefully all material found on the Internet, as it is less likely to have been through the same process of scholarly peer review as published sources.

- **Collusion.** This can involve unauthorised collaboration between students, failure to attribute assistance received, or failure to follow precisely regulations on group work projects. It is your responsibility to ensure that you are entirely clear about the extent of collaboration permitted, and which parts of the work must be your own.
- **Inaccurate citation.** It is important to cite correctly, according to the conventions of your discipline. Additionally, you should not include anything in a footnote or bibliography that you have not actually consulted. If you cannot gain access to a primary source you must make it clear in your citation that your knowledge of the work has been derived from a secondary text (e.g. Bradshaw, D. Title of book, discussed in Wilson, E., Title of book (London, 2004), p. 189).
- **Failure to acknowledge.** You must clearly acknowledge all assistance which has contributed to the production of your work, such as advice from fellow students, laboratory technicians, and other external sources. This need not apply to the assistance provided by your tutor or supervisor, nor to ordinary proofreading, but it is necessary to acknowledge other guidance which leads to substantive changes of content or approach.
- **Professional agencies.** You should neither make use of professional agencies in the production of your work nor submit material which has been written for you. It is vital to your intellectual training and development that you should undertake the research process unaided.
- **Autoplagiarism.** You must not submit work for assessment which you have already submitted (partially or in full) to fulfil the requirements of another degree course or examination.

Not just printed text!

The necessity to reference applies not only to text, but also to other media, such as computer code, illustrations, graphs etc. It applies equally to published text drawn from books and journals, and to unpublished text, whether from lecture handouts, theses or other students' essays. You must also attribute text or other resources downloaded from web sites.

Appendix E

Format for Theses and Dissertations in the Faculty of Law

The following guidance is taken from the Law Faculty Handbook for Graduate Students

1 'Thesis' here includes not only the writing submitted for the DPhil, MLitt, MPhil, or MSt, but also the essay which is submitted by a Probationer Research Student for a Qualifying Test, and dissertations offered in the examination for the BCL, MJur, or MSc. It does not include essays set by way of examination for the BCL, MJur, or MSc.

2 Every thesis must include an abstract not exceeding 300 words. The abstract must contain no footnotes. The abstract must appear immediately after the title page. Its format is governed by regulations 7 to 10 below.

3 Every thesis must contain a table of contents. The table of contents must state the titles of the chapters and their principal sub-divisions. The table of contents must be indexed to the pages where the chapters and first-level sub-headings begin.

4 Every thesis which mentions cases and statutes must contain separate tables of cases and statutes. Those tables must be indexed, so that each entry shows on what pages the case or statute in question is mentioned. The tables must appear at the beginning of the thesis, after the title page, the abstract, and the table of contents (in that order).

5 A bibliography must appear at the end of the thesis. It need not be indexed.

6 An index is not required. If there is one, it must come after the bibliography.

7 All footnotes and appendices are included in the word count. The abstract, the table of contents, the table of cases, the table of statutes, the bibliography, any headers or footers, and any index are not included in the word count.

8 The thesis must be written in English.

9 The thesis must use A4 paper.

10 The thesis must be word-processed using size 12 font on one side of the paper only, with a margin of 32 to 38 mm on the left hand side. Variations of font size may be used for headings, sub-headings, and footnotes.

11 The lines in the main text must be double spaced (8mm).

12 The first line of every paragraph must be indented unless the paragraph immediately follows a heading or sub-heading, or an indented footnote.

13 Quotations must use single inverted commas, saving double inverted commas for use for quotes within quotes. Quotations longer than two lines must be presented as a

double-indented, single-spaced paragraph with no further indentation of the first line. Such double-indented quotations must not use quotation marks.

14 Endnotes must not be used. Footnotes must be internally single spaced with double spacing between the notes.

15 The thesis must comply with OSCOLA (the Oxford Standard for Citation of Legal Authorities: <http://denning.law.ox.ac.uk/published/oscola.shtml>), or another useful standard for citation. You should consult your supervisor if you wish to depart from OSCOLA.

16 The thesis must be bound in a soft or hard cover.

17 Where the thesis is offered as part of an examination which is assessed anonymously, it must not at any point divulge the identity of the candidate or the candidate's college.

18 The word limits for theses:

	minimum	maximum
DPhil	75,000	100,000
MLitt	40,000	50,000
MPhil and MSt	25,000	30,000
QT Part B (for DPhil)	8,000	10,000
QT Part B (for MLitt)	5,000	6,000
MSc dissertation	8,000	10,000
MSc (Research Methods) dissertation	13,000	15,000

Appendix 2.

MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice

Table 1. Degree Results by Gender. 2010-2011 Academic Year

		FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL
Grade	Pass	8	7	15
	Distinction	2	0	2
	Fail	0	0	0
	Deferred	1	0	1
Total		11	7	18

Table 2. Degree Results by Gender. 2001-2010 Academic Years

	FEMALE	MALE
<i>2009-10 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	2
Pass	12	2
Fail	0	0
Deferred	0	0
<i>2008-9 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	2
Pass	5	9
Fail	0	0
Deferred	2	0
<i>2007-8 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	2
Pass	10	5
Fail	0	0
<i>2006-7 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	3
Pass	7	5
Fail	0	1
<i>2005-6 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	3	3
Pass	6	4
Fail	2	0
<i>2004-2005 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	2	2
Pass	6	4
Fail	0	0
<i>2003-2004 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	2
Pass	4	4
Fail	0	0

2002-2003 Academic Year

Distinction	2	1
Pass	6	5
Fail	0	0

2001-2002 Academic Year

Distinction	4	1
Pass	2	4
Fail	0	1

Table 3. Option results, showing the range of marks and averages

Option	Number of candidates	Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average mark
Death Penalty	6	63	76	68
Human Rights and Criminal Justice	8	57	80	68
Crime and the Family	11	56	80	65
Prisons	7	54	70	63
Crime, Political Ideology and Political Culture	11	55	75	65
Research Design and Data Collection	18	57	71	64
	<i>Including RM students: 23</i>	57	71	65
Social Explanation and Data Analysis	3	61	74	68
	<i>Including RM students: 8</i>	60	74	67
Qualitative Methods	3	63	70	67
	<i>Including RM students: 8</i>	53	75	67
Restorative Justice	5	55	68	64
	<i>Including RM students: 9</i>	55	70	63
Sentencing	10	65	73	68
Victims	9	58	72	65
Youth Justice	3	56	68	64
	<i>Including RM Students: 7</i>	56	68	64
Risk, Security and Criminal Justice	7	30	70	60
	<i>Including RM Students: 9</i>	30	70	61
Sociology of	3	63	67	65

Option	Number of candidates	Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average mark
Punishment	<i>Including RM Students: 6</i>	63	74	66
Comparative Criminal Justice	3	58	70	65
	<i>Including RM Students: 6</i>	58	75	69

Table 4. Core Course Exam results, showing the range of marks and average (including the five RM students)

Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average
52	74	66

Table 5. Dissertation results, showing the range of marks and average (excluding one candidate whose dissertation will be submitted during the next academic year)

Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average
61	73	63