

CENTRE FOR CRIMINOLOGY  
FACULTY OF LAW

Manor Road Building, Manor Road, Oxford, OX1 3UQ  
Tel: +44(0)1865 274444 | Fax: +44(0)1865 281924  
cfc@crim.ox.ac.uk | www.crim.ox.ac.uk

**MSc in CRIMINOLOGY and CRIMINAL JUSTICE**

**REPORT OF THE EXAMINERS 2016**

**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 (Roderick Bagshaw) and the Examinations Officer (Julie Bass)- who were available throughout the year for support and advice. Dedicated administrative support was received from Criminology Graduate Studies Administrator, Ms Tracy Kaye.

The Board of Examiners was supported by Dr Coretta Phillips, London School of Economics, who was enormously helpful in reading and commenting on essays, dissertations and examination scripts. The Board records thanks to Dr Phillips for her assistance as External Examiner.

**Structure of the Examination**

The elements of the examination were as follows:

- **Option essays:** In Michaelmas Term, students were required to take *two* optional seminar-based courses out of a choice of seven in Michaelmas term and three optional seminar based courses out of a choice of eight Hilary term. In Trinity Term, students were required to attend a weekly, non- examined academic workshop. All optional courses were examined by essays, the titles of which were posted at noon on Thursday of Week 7, and the essays submitted by noon on Wednesday of Week 10. Each essay, with the exception of the two methods option courses (Quantitative Analysis and Qualitative Methods) was to be no less than 3,500 and no more than 4,500 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 term, marked on a pass/fail basis, to the satisfaction of the course tutor.
- **Research Design and Data Collection ‘in term’ essays:** This compulsory research methods course taught in Michaelmas Term was examined by the successful completion of a pass/fail essay submitted in week 6 and one graded essay of 2500 – 3000 words to be submitted by week 10.
- **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 two unseen two-hour written papers on the Friday of Week 0 of Hilary Term (Friday 15 January 2016 and Friday of Week 0 of Trinity Term

(Friday 22 April 2016). Students were required to answer two questions in each examination from a choice of eight.

- **Dissertation:** The students were required to submit a Dissertation of no less than 12,000 and no more than 15,000 words by noon on Wednesday of Week 10 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 papers, and (c) the dissertation; and, in the case of candidates who have taken Quantitative 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 six assessed essays including '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 Qualitative Methods and/or Quantitative Analysis, have also satisfactorily completed the form of continuous assessment required for the relevant option: in this calculation, each core course exam and assessed essay counts as one and the dissertation counts as two papers.

### Information given to candidates

The Edict (attached at Appendix 1) was sent out to candidates in Michaelmas Term 2015 in electronic copy. The Edict was also available on the MSc Criminology Weblearn pages. Much of this information had already been available to candidates in the MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice handbook.

### 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 (for both MSc degrees together) was sent to the External Examiner. 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 2015-16 there were no such papers. Altogether the External Examiner read 60 assessments (48 essays, nine Core Course examinations and four Dissertations). This was 3 more papers than last year, due to there being more students on the course.

### Procedures and Problems

During the academic year under review, the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice received six 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 2013, 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 approved submissions for alternative arrangements during the Examination.

### **Plagiarism checks for dissertations and essays**

This was the tenth year of routine plagiarism checks in criminology. The plagiarism checks included dissertations, as well as assessed essays. Candidates were advised 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. As agreed by The Board of Examiners in TT 2012 the sampled essays and dissertations were checked for evidence of plagiarism using Turnitin by the GSA, Ms Tracy Kaye, with any identified possible cases then forwarded to the Chair of Examiners for further investigation. This year there were no candidates' submissions that showed a high level of matching through Turnitin.

### **Medical certificates and other information about factors affecting performance**

During the academic year under review the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice, had two candidates registered with the Disability Advisory Service for disability-related matters.

The MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice programme had requests for extension of time from nine students which is an increase on last year. These extensions were requested (and all granted) for health reasons.

- Two candidates received extensions for all three essays in Hilary Term.
- One candidate received an extension for one assessment in Michaelmas term, and a retrospective extension for one assessment in Hilary term.
- One candidate received retrospective extensions for all three assessments in Michaelmas term.
- One candidate received extensions for all three assessments in Michaelmas term.
- One candidate received extensions for all three assessments in Michaelmas term, and the dissertation in Trinity term
- One candidate received extensions for all three assessments in Hilary term, and the dissertation in Trinity term
- Two candidates received extensions for all three assessments in both Michaelmas and Hilary terms, and the dissertation in Trinity term. One candidate has an extension for the dissertation until December 2016, so has not completed the course yet.

### **Overall Results of the Examination**

There were 33 candidates for the MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice course. 32 candidates passed the degree, with six gaining a distinction. One candidate is still to complete the course. The candidate with the highest average for the MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice achieved 70% with 8 components at distinction level and was awarded the Roger Hood Prize, designed to recognize the best performance on the MSc at distinction level. There was also a prize awarded by Routledge for the best dissertation which was awarded to the candidate with a dissertation mark of 74%. 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 examinations**

33 students sat both exams. Each exam paper had eight questions and students had to answer two questions in each exam. Marks ranged from 52% to 76% in the first exam and from 56% and 74% in the second exam. Seven students were awarded distinction marks in the first exam and 13 in the second exam. The majority of students were awarded marks in the 60s.

### **Optional Courses**

#### ***Michaelmas Term***

##### **Prisons**

There were 15 candidates to the prisons course this term. Half of the candidates (n7) chose to address Question 3, with the other half divided equally between Question 1 (n4) and Question 2 (n4). Overall the quality of the papers was good, with half of the candidates granted a strong pass (n7), and two granted distinction. Of the six remaining, one was granted a pass and the others a good pass. While Question 2 and Question 3 elicited a wide range of marks, Question 1 elicited only strong answers marked between 65 and 71.

##### **Research Design and Data Collection**

Altogether 34 students took the course (33 MSc plus 1 DPhil student). In the assessment 20 answered question 1, eight answered question 2, and six answered question 3. A relatively wide range of marks were awarded, with a low of 58 and a high of 72. Some seven students were awarded distinction level grades – some of these essays were very good indeed.

##### **Race and Gender**

Three candidates took the race and gender course this term, which though smaller than usual, provided for an excellent dynamic during the seminars and allowed in-depth engagement with the issues which is perhaps reflected by the high quality answers and marks awarded. Each candidate answered one of the three possible questions and all the papers were strong - with two distinctions and the other paper graded as a strong pass.

##### **Politics of Crime Control**

11 candidates were assessed for this option. They were required to answer one question from a selection of three. Two students opted to answer question 1, six answered question 2 and four answered question 3.

##### **Victims and Restorative Justice**

Eight candidates entered for this assessment. One candidate answered question 1' The remaining 7 answered question 2. No one answered question 3 on 'Why is it important for the state to attempt to repair the harms caused by crime and the criminal justice system?'

Those who achieved high marks did so for critical engagement with the academic literature, clear, coherent writing and theoretical sophistication. Those papers that described, rather than analysing the relevant literature and debates received lower grades, as did those papers with short reading lists that did not reflect the wide range of material on the course list. Those candidates who wrote well, providing a clear structure, roadmap and signposting for their papers received better marks than those with errors of syntax or weak structure.

##### **Public and Private Policing**

Some 13 students took the course this year. In the assessment five answered question 1, two answered question 2, and six answered question 3. Essays were generally proficient rather than outstanding. There was much evidence of deep and detailed library research, even in the weaker

efforts, but this was not often translated into a successful final effort. Marks ranged from 58 to 70, with one distinction level grade. Most clustered around the mid-60s.

### **Crime and the Family**

All four students this year answered the same essay question about the relatives of serious offenders. Marks ranged from 60 to a Distinction. The better answers provided original critical analysis of a high standard and a clearly structured argument.

### **Criminal Justice, Migration and Citizenship**

The essays in Criminal Justice, Migration and Citizenship were all of good quality. Agreed marks ranged from 58 to 70 with an even spread of marks across the group. Two out of the 12 papers were awarded distinctions. Seven students answered question 1, three answered question 2 and only two answered question 3.

### ***Hilary Term***

#### **Comparative Criminal Justice, Security and Human Rights**

This year's paper saw a wide range of scores awarded, with four Distinctions, ten papers in the 2(1) bracket, and one pass. Answers were distributed across the questions, with three candidates attempting Q1, five candidates attempting Q2, and six candidates attempting Q3.

Strong answers engaged critically with a wide range of secondary sources, and gave detailed analysis of the case law. Weaker answers tended to be overly descriptive, repetitive, or assertion-filled, often making inaccurate generalisations across jurisdictions. The examiners were pleased to see some papers develop quite sophisticated and innovative arguments in relation to the materials.

#### **Qualitative Methods**

The qualitative methods course assessments were of a very high quality, with most marks falling within the mid-60s mark range. Four distinctions were awarded and there were a good spread of answers across the choice of questions - those answering on visual methods were particularly creative in their approach. A few essays were reduced in quality because of a lack of attention to grammar and referencing style.

#### **Risk, Security and Criminal Justice**

Fourteen candidates took this option. Three candidates answered question 1, four answered question 2, and seven answered question 3. The standard of the essays was generally very good, though there were fewer Distinction marks than in previous years,. Most essays engaged effectively with the questions set, though a few veered quite a long way from the essay question.

A few essays seemed a bit rushed and referred to a relatively small number of sources.

The very best essays engaged really effectively with the literature, the relevant academic debates and available research evidence to answer the question set. Overall, these were a good set of essays by a strong cohort, with several essays scoring marks in the high 60s.

#### **Violence and Civilisation**

There were two distinctions (70 and 71). Three essays scored between 65-69, and three between 60-64. One essay was considerably lower than the rest, scoring 54. There was some imbalance in the spread of questions students chose to answer. Six students answered question 1 and only three answered either question 2 or 3. This may be because the latter two questions were country-specific and students did not feel that they had sufficient expertise about the countries in question. It may be worth considering doing fewer country studies in greater depth next year.

## **Quantitative Analysis for Social Sciences**

Some 13 students took the assessment this term, two on a pass/fail basis. All students passed, with a range of marks from 60 to 75 (mean 66.5). Three students achieved a distinction level grade. As the mean suggests the standard overall was relatively high, although the three essays that received a distinction were demonstrably more advanced than the others.

## **Sentencing**

The quality of the sentencing essays this year was higher than in previous years the examiners believe. There was greater depth to the essays, and this may reflect the additional time that they spent on the subject, reading and discussing in class as a result of the move to eight week teaching. Most people answered the essay question on the recidivist premium at sentencing most did a good job., There were several good and imaginative answers to the 'most pressing problem in sentencing' title. There was one essay significantly weaker than the rest and at the same time there was one essay which was truly exceptional, and was awarded a 75 but even this mark could easily have been higher. All in all, a good collection of essays showing that the students had worked hard and in most cases gone well beyond the readings assigned for the course.

## **Youth Justice**

The quality of submissions for youth justice was high. Of the 10 candidates, three were awarded Distinctions; two received marks in the higher 60s; and four in the lower 60s. Five candidates chose to answer the question on the age of criminal responsibility; two answered the question on diversion; and three on youth imprisonment. The essays that received a Distinction provided original, focused answers to the question with a high level of independent critical analysis.

## **The Death Penalty**

Eleven candidates were assessed for the death penalty option. The marks range was from 56 to 73, with one candidate being awarded a distinction. Seven students answered question 1, one answered question 2 and three answered question 3. One student exceeded the maximum word count of 4,500 by c.650 words. The candidates who did particularly well ensured that they had answered all parts of the question fully. For example, on the question of costs of an arbitrary death penalty process, the candidates who gained high marks tended to write fully about the costs to the legitimacy of the system as well as the individual costs. Similarly those candidates who tackled the question on evolving standards of decency gained higher marks when they not only talked the substantive issues but considered the methodological challenges to measuring evolving standards. While most papers were well written and fluent, some students lost marks for typographical and grammatical errors that might have been picked up through a closer proof reading before submission.

## ***Trinity Term***

### **Dissertations**

All candidates submitted their dissertations on time, although one candidate has an approved extension until December 2016 so this has yet to be marked. The range of topics was wide and interesting. Most candidates presented well-researched and well-written papers. All students passed, with twelve obtaining distinctions. Marks ranged from 59% to 76%.

C Phillips (External)

R Condry (Chair)

B Bradford

C Hoyle

September 2016

## **Appendix 1**

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

**FACULTY OF LAW  
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD**

#### **MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice NOTICE TO CANDIDATES 2015-2016**

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 weblearn site <https://weblearn.ox.ac.uk/portal/hierarchy/socsci/law/crim/page/resources>. If you believe that it may contain an error, please notify the Chair of Examiners (Dr Rachel Condry) 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 <http://www.ox.ac.uk/students/selfservice>

#### **A. Information for Candidates Assessed Essays for the Options and compulsory Research Methods course.**

##### **1. Timing**

###### **Michaelmas Term 2015**

**Thursday 27 November 2015 (Noon):** Essay titles shall be posted on the Graduate Student Noticeboard at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by email.

**Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> December 2015 (Noon):** Candidates must submit the required work to the Clerk of Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

###### **Hilary Term 2016**

**Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2016 (Noon):** Essay titles shall be posted on the Graduate Student Noticeboard at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by email.

**Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2016 (Noon):** Candidates must submit the required work to the Clerk of the Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

###### **Trinity Term 2016**

**Wednesday 29 June 2016 (Noon):** Candidates must submit the required work to the Clerk of the Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

#### **2. Method of Assessment**

All courses (other than 'Research Design and Data Collection', 'Quantitative Analysis for Social Scientists' and 'Qualitative Methods') shall be examined by means of an assessed essay of 3,500 – 4,500 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.

‘Research Design and Data Collection’, ‘Quantitative Methods for Social Scientists’ 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 three courses a selection of three titles will be given, from which students must choose one. In addition, candidates taking any of these courses 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 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 envelope. 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 (Declaration of Authorship) 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/current/assessedessays.php>. 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 <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/examregs/2015-16/rftcoue-p14ls-n-snawfromexam/> ).

Two copies of each of the essays must be delivered in an envelope 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 Criminology Graduate Studies Administrator, Tracy Kaye ([tracy.kaye@crim.ox.ac.uk](mailto:tracy.kaye@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 2014 pages 29-30 Part 14. 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 unit(s) in question. Non-submission includes where the Examiners refuse to examine work which exceeds the word limit (see Section A.4. below). Candidates are reminded that they must pass in all assessment areas in order to pass the degree (see Section D Overall Assessment and Publication of Results, 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 [http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/examregs/2015-16/rftcoue-p16markandasse/16.6 \(1\)](http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/examregs/2015-16/rftcoue-p16markandasse/16.6 (1)). Those who write less than the lower limit may likewise be penalized.

## 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 (<http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/statutes/regulations/288-072.shtml>) 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/edc/goodpractice/>; 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 Criminology Weblearn site <https://weblearn.ox.ac.uk/portal/hierarchy/socsci/law/crim/page/resources>.

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 <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/examregs/2015-16/rftcoue-p14ls-n-snawfromexam/>)

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 22 January 2016, the results of the Hilary Term essays by Friday 29 April 2016 and the results of the Trinity Term essays by Friday 22 July 2016 (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 Examinations**

This year the MSc written examinations for the Core Courses are scheduled to take place as follows:

1. 'Explanation and Understanding in Criminology' is scheduled to take place in Week 0 of Hilary Term, provisionally **Friday 15<sup>th</sup> January 2016**.
2. 'Understanding Criminal Justice' is scheduled to take place in Week 0 of Trinity Term, provisionally **Friday 22 April 2016**

The dates and times will be confirmed in the Examination Timetable, to be published online at <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/aad/exams/operations/> no later than five weeks prior to each 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 Examinations will take place in the Examinations Schools (to be confirmed) 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. Notices in the waiting area will inform you which room and desk number you are allocated to. Desks are listed by number and lists are displayed outside each exam room to remind you which desk number you have been allocated.

The Examinations Schools will send you an individual timetable listing your candidate number and the time and dates of the examination no later than two weeks before the examination begins. You are permitted to bring this note with you to the examination room to remind yourself of your candidate number. Should you forget to bring your candidate number, the invigilators will be able to provide this once you are seated in the examination room.

It is essential that you take your university ID card with you for all exams. If you lose your card you should your college office immediately to order a replacement. 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).

### **3. 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 <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/examregs/2015-16/rftcoue-p14ls-n-snawfromexam/>). 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 before the examination and after the examination has started, see the Examination Regulations 2014, <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/examregs/2015-16/rftcoue-p14ls-n-snawfromexam/>.

**6. Special remarks concerning the paper**

Both examinations will be two hours long. There will be eight questions on each paper. Candidates must answer TWO questions in each examination.

**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 first Core Course examination paper will be marked, alongside the Hilary Term essays and the second examination paper will be marked alongside the Dissertation, in June. The Examiners hope to be able to publish the results by Friday 22nd July 2016.

## **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 6th November 2015 (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 <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/examregs/2015-16/rftcoue-p13fapianexam/> 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 24<sup>th</sup> February 2016 (Noon):** Candidates must submit a working title for their proposed dissertation to the Graduate Studies Administrator by email.

**Friday 18<sup>th</sup> March 2016:** Candidates will be informed by this date the name of their Dissertation Supervisor.

#### **Trinity Term**

**Friday 3rd June 2016:** Deadline for the final title for the candidate's dissertation to be approved by the Dissertation Supervisor and the Chair of Examiners.

**Wednesday 29<sup>th</sup> June 2016 (Noon):** Candidates must submit the Dissertation to the Clerk of the Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

### **2. Method of Assessment**

The Dissertation shall be between **12,000 and 15,000 words** (*inclusive of footnotes, but excluding the abstract, table of contents, table of cases, table of statutes, appendices, 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.

### **3. 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 2015-2016 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 weblearn site <https://weblearn.ox.ac.uk/portal/hierarchy/socsci/law/crim/page/resources>. 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 <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/examregs/2015-16/rftcoue-p16markandas/> 16.6)

Two copies of the Dissertation must be delivered in an envelope to the Clerk of Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford. The 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 Criminology Graduate Studies Administrator, Tracy Kaye at [tracy.kaye@crim.ox.ac.uk](mailto:tracy.kaye@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 <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/examregs/2015-16/rftcoue-p16markandasse/> 16.6. 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).

#### **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 <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/examregs/2015-16/rftcoue-p16markandasse/> 16.6. Those who write less than the lower limit may likewise be penalized.

#### **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 <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/statutes/regulations/288-072.shtml>) 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/edc/goodpractice/> 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 Criminology Weblearn site: <https://weblearn.ox.ac.uk/portal/hierarchy/socsci/law/crim/page/resources>.

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 <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/examregs/2015-16/rftcoue-p14ls-n-snawfromexam/> . 16.6).

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.

## **6. Results**

The Examiners hope to be able to publish the dissertation results by Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2016 (i.e. the date upon which the Final Results are provisionally due to be published).

### **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, as well as satisfactorily completes the continuous assessment element of where relevant 'Quantitative Analysis for Social Scientists' and/or 'Qualitative Methods'. The examiners award a distinction to any candidate who achieves marks of at least 70 per cent on at least six of the papers, as well as satisfactorily completes the continuous assessment element of where relevant 'Quantitative Analysis for Social Scientists' and/or 'Qualitative Methods'. In this calculation, both the core course and the dissertation shall count as two papers and each assessed essay shall count as one.

The Examiners hope to publish the final results by Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2016. 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/?path=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/info/pam/> Sections 9, 10, and 11 have relevance for examinations.

### **Board of Examiners**

C Phillips (External Examiner)  
R. Condry (Chair)  
B Bradford  
C Hoyle

**Date 11 November 2015**

## **Appendix A**

### **MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice 2015-2016**

#### **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 <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/statutes/regulations/288-072.shtml>, Part 19,) **and the Proctors' Administrative Regulations for Candidates in Examinations** (see Examination Regulations <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/statutes/regulations/253-114.shtml> Part 20).

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. Water in spill-proof bottles (not screw top bottles) is the only refreshments allowed into the examination room.
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 2015-2016**

#### **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 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, as well as satisfactorily completes the continuous assessment element of where relevant 'Quantitative Analysis for Social Scientists' and/or 'Qualitative Methods'.
  - (b) The examiners award a distinction to any candidate who achieves marks of at least 70 per cent on at least six of the papers, as well as satisfactorily completes the continuous assessment element of where relevant 'Quantitative Analysis for Social Scientists' and/or 'Qualitative Methods'. In this calculation, both the core course and the dissertation shall count as two papers and each assessed essay shall count as one.
  - (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.
  - (d). Students are expected to draw on the course readings in their options papers. While they may be rewarded for doing this and going beyond them to draw in additional work, examiners may reduce the mark of those who fail to cite course readings.
  - e). 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 2014, pp. 35, para. 16.6. . Those who write less than the lower limit may likewise be penalized.

## Appendix C

### **MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice 2015-2016**

#### **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 and clarity of expression, 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.

**'Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists' and 'Qualitative Methods'**

To pass these research methods courses 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/8examinations/> 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?

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. This includes translation services and services that improve and edit your written English. 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 are included in the word count. The abstract, the table of contents, the table of cases, the table of statutes, the bibliography, the appendices, 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://www.law.ox.ac.uk/publications/oscola.php>), 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:

	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>maximum</b>
<b>DPhil</b>	75,000	100,000
<b>MLitt</b>	40,000	50,000
<b>MPhil and MSt</b>	25,000	30,000
<b>QT Part B (for DPhil)</b>	8,000	10,000
<b>QT Part B (for MLitt)</b>	5,000	6,000
<b>MSc dissertation</b>	12,000	15,000

## Appendix 2.

### **MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice**

Table 1. Degree Results by Gender. 2015-2016 Academic Year

		FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL
Grade	Pass	18	8	26
	Distinction	4	2	6
	Fail	0	0	0
Total		22	10	32

Table 2. Degree Results by Gender. 2011-2015 Academic Years

		FEMALE	MALE
<i>2014-2015 Academic Year</i>			
Distinction		5	2
Pass		13	4
Fail		0	0
<i>2013-2014 Academic Year</i>			
Distinction		1	3
Pass		12	7
Fail		0	0
<i>2012-2013 Academic Year</i>			
Distinction		2	3
Pass		13	9
Fail		1	0
<i>2011-2012 Academic Year</i>			
Distinction		5	0
Pass		12	9
Fail		2	0
Deferred		1	0

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

Option	Number of candidates	Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average mark
Crime & Family	3	60	70	66
Race & Gender	3	67	72	70
Public and Private Policing	12	58	70	64
Death Penalty	11	56	73	65
Research Design and Data Collection	32	58	72	66

Option	Number of candidates	Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average mark
Victims and Restorative Justice	8	60	73	67
Qualitative Methods	14	62	74	67
Prisons	14	53	71	64
Politics of Crime Control	11	64	72	68
Comparative Criminal Justice , security and Human Rights	14	52	71	66
Quantitative Analysis for Social Sciences	10	62	75	67
Violence and Civilisation	9	54	71	64
Risk, Security and Criminal Justice	14	58	70	65
Sentencing	14	61	76	68
CJ, Migration and citizenship	12	58	70	65
Youth Justice	10	62	71	66

Table 4. Core Course Exam results, showing the range of marks and average for 32 students

	Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average
Core Course 1 exam	61	76	67
Core Course 2 exam	57	74	68

Table 5. Dissertation results, showing the range of marks and average for 32 students

Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average
59	76	68