

**MSc in CRIMINOLOGY and CRIMINAL JUSTICE**  
**REPORT OF THE EXAMINERS 2009**

**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, and the Director of Examinations (Mark Freedland) 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, Mrs Cathy Byford, and, during the final few weeks, Ms Iris Geens, without whom the examinations process would not have run as well as it did. The Board of Examiners would like to record its appreciation for Mrs Byford and Ms Geens' efficiency and professionalism throughout the year.

The Board of Examiners was supported by Professor Dick Hobbs from the London School of Economics who was enormously helpful in reading and commenting on essays, dissertations and examination scripts. The Board would like to record our thanks to Professor Hobbs for his service as External Examiner for the last three years. In September 2009 we will welcome our new External Examiner, Professor Benjamin Bowling from Kings College, London.

**Structure of the Examination**

The structure of the examination was unchanged 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 courses (out of a choice of four in Michaelmas and six in Hilary term). In Trinity Term, students were required to take *one* of four optional seminar courses. All optional seminar courses were examined by essays, the titles of which were posted on Friday of 6<sup>th</sup> week, and the essays submitted by noon on Friday of 9<sup>th</sup> week. Each essay, with the exception of the three 'in house' methods courses (Research Design and Data Collection in MT; Social Explanation and Data Analysis in HT, and Qualitative Methods in HT) was to be no less than 3,500 and no more than 5,000 words. In all options the candidates chose one essay title from a choice of three. The three methods options were assessed in the same way except 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.

- **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 Thursday of week 0 of Trinity Term (Thursday 23 April 2009). Students were required to answer three questions from a choice of twelve.
- **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 9<sup>th</sup> week 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 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. The examiners award a Distinction to any candidate who achieves marks of 70 per cent or more on at least five of the papers. In this calculation, both the core course and the dissertation count as two.

### **Information given to candidates**

The Edict (attached as Appendix 1) was sent out to candidates in Michaelmas term 2008 in hard and electronic copy. The Edict was also put 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 receive a hard copy of these documents and they are also available on the intranet).

### **Marking**

Each option essay, dissertation and core course examination paper was 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 under Appendix B and the Assessment Standards under Appendix C). All papers where a mark of 49% or below had been given were sent to the External Examiner (there was one such paper), as were borderline papers (where a mark of 69% had been awarded) (there was one such paper) and a range of other essays and scripts. Altogether the External Examiner read ten essays, three Core Course examination scripts and three Dissertations.

### **Procedures and Problems**

Generally speaking, this year presented no major administrative difficulties. However, one student was reported to the Proctors for suspected plagiarism (see below) and another has delayed completion of her degree until 2009-10 for medical reasons.

### **Plagiarism checks**

This was the third year of routine plagiarism checks in criminology. Candidates were warned in the Course Handbook, in a supplementary examinations edict, and at a seminar on writing for assessments, that each term a random sample of essays would be checked for plagiarism. Accordingly, they were asked each term to submit electronically a copy of each of their essays 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 assessed essays and checking a selection of paragraphs and phrases using 'google', developed and first used in 2006-2007, first

assessors for each option checked a third of the submitted essays, drawn randomly by the Chair of Examiners. This process applies only to assessed essays and not the dissertations. This year this process revealed one case of plagiarism, which was referred to the Proctors and an academic penalty imposed.

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 does not currently own software for checking plagiarism. Turnitin became available during this academic year but the Criminology Board of Examiners were divided on whether or not it would prove to be an efficient and appropriate resource for the Masters programme. In response to the Board's concerns, the Criminology Board of Studies discussed the matter in full in Trinity Term 2008 and decided not to introduce Turnitin for 2008-09, but rather to 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**

The following medical certificates were received:

- One student successfully applied to the Proctors for permission for late submission of their two Hilary term essay papers for medical reasons.
- One student successfully applied for an extension for their dissertation for medical reasons.
- Two students received Proctoral agreement to receive extra time for the written examination paper for the core course, due to medical reasons (and one was permitted to take the core course examination in college).
- One student received extensions on all their papers and has received permission to extend their dissertation submission date until 15<sup>th</sup> January 2010.
- One student submitted a piece of coursework almost four hours late, but was retrospectively offered an extension by the Proctors. The Board of Examiners decided not to impose an academic penalty.

### **Changes to the Examination Rubric**

During the year the Board of Studies proposed and approved two changes to examination procedures, both of which will take effect from October 2009:

#### *Core course exam*

The Board expressed concern that some candidates for the core course examination had in the previous year answered only criminology questions or only criminal justice questions, which meant that a whole term's work was effectively unexamined. The Board asked the two core course examiners to produce a report on this, following the examination of this year's core course.

A breakdown of the questions attempted by each candidate during the academic year 2008-2009 was circulated to the Board in Trinity term. Eight candidates had attempted questions solely from the 'Explanation and Understanding in Criminology' part of the core course exam, and three had attempted questions solely from the 'Understanding of Criminal Justice' part. Twelve had attempted a mix (i.e. one from part 1, one from part 2, and a third from either).

The Board approved the proposal to divide the core course examination paper into two sections: section A (covering criminological topics) and section B (covering criminal justice topics) and amend the examination rubric so that candidates are required to select one question from section A, one from section B and a third from either section. This change was proposed to avoid candidates choosing only criminology or only criminal justice questions. It was agreed to alter the rubric for next year as follows: "Candidates must answer three questions; at least one from each section".

### *Requirement for a Distinction*

During the 2008-2009 academic year, the Board of Studies held discussions on the requirements for distinctions within similar departments in other universities and on similar Masters programmes within the Social Science Division (SSD) in order to better understand if our examination processes were fair. In particular the Board was concerned about the difference between the two degrees: candidates on the research methods variant of the MSc were required to gain a distinction on their dissertation to achieve an overall distinction, but students on the original MSc were not. There was also concern that it was easier to get a distinction on this degree (with distinctions required for 5 of 9 components) than for the Research Methods variant (which requires 3 of 4 distinctions).

The Board considered whether a distinction for the Master's dissertation should be required to gain an overall distinction for the degree. (Other institutions do require this, though within other SSD departments at Oxford, this is not always the case.) This discussion raised the further question of whether the two MSc Criminology degrees should be made consistent with each other.

Having discussed the requirement for a distinction in the dissertation on the Research Methods degree, and the difference in distinction requirements between the two degrees, it was agreed to:

- i) remove the requirement for Research Methods candidates to obtain a distinction for their dissertation in order to gain a distinction overall;
- and
- ii) introduce the requirement for MSc students to achieve a distinction in 6 (instead of only 5) of the nine exam components in order to achieve an overall distinction for their MSc.

These changes mean that from October 2009 MSc students would need to achieve a distinction in 6 out of the 9 components (where the core course exam and dissertation are double-weighted and each count as two components), in order to be awarded an overall distinction, whereas Research Methods students will need to gain a distinction on any 3 out of the 4 components for their degree in order to be awarded an overall distinction.

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

There were nineteen candidates for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice. Two candidates will continue their studies into the next academic year: one was granted a medical extension and one failed one of the three course components. All other candidates passed the degree; three gained distinctions. One candidate did extremely well, with a weighted average of 73% and was therefore awarded the Roger Hood Prize, designed to recognize the best performance on the MSc at Distinction level. Two other students also did very well, both obtaining a distinction in six components, with a 71%

and 69% weighted average respectively. The candidate with the 71% weighted average received the *proximae* prize. Overall the performance of the candidates was very creditable. 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**

The examination for the core course was taken by 19 students. The quality of the answers to this year's core course was high. None of the students failed this component. One received a 50% grade (as confirmed by the External Examiner). The rest achieved 61% or above, and five gained a distinction.

### **Optional Courses**

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

##### *Mafias (Professor Federico Varese)*

Eleven students submitted papers for this option. Three students answered question 1, two students answered question 2, and the remaining candidates answered question 3. The examiners awarded three distinctions. No one failed. Most papers obtained a grade in the 65 region. The examiners were pleased with the overall quality of submissions.

##### *Methods I: Research Design and Data Collection (Professor Federico Varese)*

Seven students submitted papers for this option. Two answered question 1 and the rest answered question 2. The examiners awarded three distinctions (one was a high distinction). No paper was below 65. In sum, the examiners were pleased with the overall quality of submissions.

##### *Prisons (Dr Mary Bosworth)*

Thirteen students submitted their essays for the Prisons option. Of these, eleven answered the question on decency and legitimacy, while one elected to answer the question on gender and the other on Jack Straw's recent speech. The papers were generally of good quality, with one particularly outstanding, and another three distinctions. All achieved passing grades.

##### *Race and Gender (Dr Mary Bosworth)*

Ten students submitted essays and all passed. Overall the papers were fine. Two distinctions were awarded, two others came in above the 65% threshold and the rest were between 52% and 64%. Five of the papers tackled the question on globalisation, one addressed the question of recasting the relationship between victim and offender, and three answered the intersectionality question. Both of the distinction grades addressed the question on globalisation.

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

##### *Restorative Justice (Dr Carolyn Hoyle)*

Eleven students submitted assessed essays. All passed, four with distinction.

Two students answered the first question about justice aims and practices being seen in oppositional terms. One got a mid pass, the other a distinction. Both papers were reasonably strong on the theoretical debates within the literature about whether RJ should be conceived of as punishment and the extent to which retribution and restoration were diametrically opposed. The one that received a lower grade was not so well developed or articulated and had a number of errors of syntax.

Six students answered the second question about whether RJ should be reserved for the 'shallow end' of criminal justice. Four papers were awarded mid-high passes, one a low pass and one a distinction. The essay which was awarded a distinction was a wide-ranging and well structured paper which problematised all of the key concepts, was balanced, authoritative and beautifully written.

Two students answered the third question on post-conflict societies. Both candidate were awarded a distinction for theoretically sophisticated, wide-ranging and well-written papers, 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.

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

Nine essays were submitted for this course. 1 student completed Question 1, three students completed Question 2(b) and 5 students did question 3. Nobody attempted question 2(a). Two essays were marked as distinctions. The lowest mark was 63. Plagiarism checks were carried out on three essays and no problems were identified.

#### *Law, Economics and Crime (Professor Federico Varese)*

Five students submitted papers for this option. Three students answered question 3 ("Is Libertarian Paternalism' an oxymoron or a viable approach to reform aspects of law making?"); one candidate answered question 1 ("How does 'Behavioral Law and Economics' explain market manipulation?"); and one answered question 3 ("If criminals discount risk and the future, as suggested by 'Behavioral Law and Economics', what policies might reduce crime?"). Most of the essays were carefully argued, engaged with the literature and in some cases went beyond the material covered in class. The assessors awarded one distinction.

#### *Qualitative Research Methods (Dr Mary Bosworth)*

Only the three MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice (Research Methods) students and one DPhil student took this option. No MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice attempted this course.

#### *Research Methods II: Social Explanation and Data Analysis (Professor Federico Varese)*

Five students submitted papers for the option. The workload for the class included weekly 'research design' assignments and simple statistical exercises. All students handed in the weekly assignments in time and answered the questions in full.

The exam question asked the candidates to: "write a research proposal that involves the use of one or more methods of data collection and analysis. The proposed research

should examine: 1. A criminal organization or network of your choice; 2. A criminal justice institution of your own choice; 3. A criminal behaviour of your own choice."

Two candidates chose to answer question 1; two candidates chose to answer question 2; one candidate chose to answer question 3. The assessors were overall quite happy with the quality of submissions, although one candidate failed.

#### *Public Opinion (Professor Julian Roberts)*

Almost all the candidates (eight out of nine) chose the question about the role of public opinion in sentencing policy. No-one elected to answer the question that asked for a research design. The answers were generally good, with not a great range from the lowest to the highest grade. Following agreement of the marks by the two examiners, there were 3 distinction grades, and the average mark of the public opinion option was 67. The lowest grade was 61 and the highest 71.

#### **Trinity Term**

##### *Desistance from Crime (Dr Ros Burnett)*

There were seven candidates. Five students answered Question 2, one answered Question 1 and one answered Question 3. The second question may have seemed superficially more straightforward to answer, hence its popularity. Those who chose this question could have raised the standard of their answers by more fine-grained analysis of distinctive theoretical perspectives and points of tension between them with differing implications for rehabilitative practice and for work with young people as distinct from adults. The answer to Question 1 revealed excellent skills in drawing on a wide range of literature to construct a convincing and sophisticated argument. A stronger answer to Question 3 would have also included further discussion of the interaction between structural and identity variables.

##### *Death Penalty (Dr Carolyn Hoyle)*

Five students submitted assessed essays: all passed, one with distinction. One candidate answered question 1 about the influence of international human rights law. Two candidates answered question 2, about deterrence, and two answered question 3 about the influence of cultural, structural, and political variables. The paper awarded a distinction had answered this question and had written a more theoretically sophisticated paper which went beyond describing these variables to analysing *how* these factors influenced the administration of the death penalty. 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.

##### *Sentencing (Prof Andrew Ashworth)*

Eleven candidates took the course and submitted assessed essays. Five candidates wrote on Question 1, comparing the advantages and disadvantages of US and English guideline styles. Three candidates wrote on Question 2, on social adversity as a ground for sentence mitigation. Three candidates wrote on Question 3, assessing the current English legislation on previous convictions and sentencing. Overall, the essays showed a good fundamental understanding of the subject. The best candidates showed a wide range of reading and a willingness to assess the material critically, but the general standard perhaps fell a little below the standard of discussions in the seminars. Three

Distinction marks were awarded, reflecting some excellent work by those candidates; but some essays were less well structured and not properly referenced.

*Victims (Dr Carolyn Hoyle)*

Two students took this option. One received a Medical Certificate extension. Both passed with marks above 60.

### **Dissertations**

The range of topics was wide and interesting. All candidates presented well-researched and well-written papers. All passed, with seven obtaining distinctions. Two students were awarded a grade in the fifties, with the lowest mark being 57%. 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.

D. Hobbs (External)  
C. Hoyle (Chair)  
I. Loader  
J. Roberts

July 2009

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

**FACULTY OF LAW  
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD**

**MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice  
NOTICE TO CANDIDATES 2008-2009**

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/current\\_students/student\\_information.html](http://www.ox.ac.uk/current_students/student_information.html).

**A. Information for Candidates regarding the Assessed Essays for Options**

**1. Timing**

**Michaelmas Term 2008**

**Friday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2008 (Noon):** Essay titles shall be posted on the MSc notice board at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by e-mail.

**Friday 12<sup>th</sup> December 2008 (Noon):** Students must submit the required work to the Clerk of Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

**Hilary Term 2009**

**Friday 27<sup>th</sup> February 2009 (Noon):** Essay titles shall be posted on the MSc notice board at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by email.

**Friday 20<sup>th</sup> March 2009 (Noon):** Students must submit the required work to the Clerk of the Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

**Trinity Term 2009**

**Friday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2009 (Noon):** Essay titles shall be posted on the MSc notice board at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by email.

**Friday 26<sup>th</sup> June 2009 (Noon):** Students 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 I: Research Design and Data Collection' and 'Methods II: Social Explanation and Data Analysis' and 'Qualitative Methods' – the three methods options – and 'Law, Economics and Crime') 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.

The assessment of 'Methods I: Research Design and Data Collection' and 'Methods II: Social Explanation and Data Analysis' and 'Qualitative Methods' (the three methods options) and 'Law, Economics and Crime' is as follows. 'Methods I: Research Design and Data Collection' shall be 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*). A selection of three titles will be given, from which students must choose one. 'Methods II: Social Explanation and Data Analysis' shall be 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*). The essay shall be an imaginary research proposal of the candidate's own devising; a selection of three topics will be given, from which students must choose one. 'Qualitative Methods' shall be 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*). A selection of three titles will be given, from which students must choose one. 'Law, Economics and Crime' shall be 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*). A selection of three titles will be given, from which students must choose one. In addition, candidates taking any of these four options shall be required to complete to the satisfaction of the course leader for the option assessments 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. The Director of Graduate Studies will certify to the Clerk of the Schools the names of those students who have done so.

## **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).

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 ([cathy.byford@crim.ox.ac.uk](mailto:cathy.byford@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 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 2008, pp 45-46, 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 2008, p. 44, 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 2008, Part 19.4. and 19.5, p. 51) 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/general\\_information.htm](http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/MSC/general_information.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**.

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 Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> January 2009, the results of the Hilary Term essays by Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2009 and the results of the Trinity Term essays by Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2009 (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 is scheduled to take place in Week 0 of Trinity term, provisionally on **Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2009, 9.30 a.m.** Joint Core Course:

'Explanation and Understanding in Criminology and Understanding Criminal Justice'. The date and time will be confirmed in the Examination Timetable, to be published five weeks prior to the examination.

## **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. Desks will be identified by **name** only. The Examination Schools will notify you of your examination number. 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) Use of bilingual dictionaries by non-native English speakers**

A candidate whose native language is not English and who wishes to take into any examination a bilingual dictionary (covering English and the candidate's native language) must apply for permission from the Proctors, through the Senior Tutor of the candidate's college, **by Friday 7 November 2008**. Late requests will not be entertained.

The dictionary will be inspected by the Chair of Examiners (or another Examiner) at the beginning of the Examination. The use of electronic dictionaries is not permitted.

### **(ii) Other materials**

No other books or papers whatsoever may be taken into the examination room.

### **(iii) 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.

## **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 script, even if an answer book contains a box labeled "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 2008, 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 2008, 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; candidates will be required to answer THREE questions.

### ***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 essay and the Dissertation, in June. The Examiners hope to be able to publish the results by Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2009.

### ***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 7<sup>th</sup> November 2008 (Week 4)**. 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 2008, 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**

**Friday 27<sup>th</sup> February 2009 (noon):** Students must submit the title of their proposed dissertation to the MSc Course Administrator by email – [cathy.byford@crim.ox.ac.uk](mailto:cathy.byford@crim.ox.ac.uk)

**Friday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2009:** Students 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 26<sup>th</sup> June 2009 (Noon):** Students 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 2008, p. 44, 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 7.6 of the MSc Student Handbook 2008-2009 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, 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, 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).

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"

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 thesis or other exercise 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 2008, pp. 45-46, para. 16.8. Candidates should consult their college adviser 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 2008, p. 44 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 2008, Part 19.4 and 19.5. p. 51) 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.’

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 Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2009** (i.e. the date upon which the Final Results are to be published).

## **D. Overall Assessment and Publication of Class List**

The degree of MSc is awarded to any candidate who achieves a mark of at least 50 per cent for each of its three components: (1) the unseen core course exam, (2), the assessed essays and (3) 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. The examiners award a distinction to any candidate who achieves marks of at least 70 per cent on at least five of the papers; in this calculation, both the core course and the dissertation count as two papers.

The Examiners hope to publish the class list on **Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2009**. The class list will be posted in the Examination Schools. Please note that results will not be available over the telephone from the Examination Schools, the Law Faculty Office, or from the Centre for Criminology. The Examination Schools will formally communicate their results directly to each candidate; this may be done on-line or by post. For further information see [http://www.ox.ac.uk/current\\_students/student\\_information.html](http://www.ox.ac.uk/current_students/student_information.html). Informal individual transcripts (giving the break down of marks) will be e-mailed and mailed direct to candidates at their colleges once the list is posted in the Examination Schools.

## **E. 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.

**D. Hobbs (external)**

**C. Hoyle (Chair)**

**I. Loader**

**J. Roberts**

**28<sup>th</sup> October 2008**

## Appendix A

### MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice 2008-2009

#### 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 2008, Part 19, pages 51-52) **and the Proctors' Administrative Regulations for Candidates in Examinations** (see Examination Regulations 2008, Part 20, pages 52-54).

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. If you have been permitted by the Proctors to use a bilingual dictionary during the examination, it will be inspected by an Examiner at the beginning of the examination. It should be left on your desk until the examination is concluded.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. Do not bring mobile telephones or any other electronic devices into the examination room.
11. Do not bring any papers 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.
12. If you require more paper, raise your hand (preferably with a piece of paper in it) and it will be brought to you.

13. 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.

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

15. 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 2008-2009

#### 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 five 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 '70/2½' ('70 over 2½ 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 2008-2009

#### 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 analysis with 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.

50-54: Pass: basic analytical skills apparent from identification of intellectual problems with some structured discussion of them.

##### **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' and 'Law, Economics and Crime'**

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:

	<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>	8,000	10,000
<b>MSc (Research Methods) dissertation</b>	13,000	15,000

## Appendix 2.

### MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice

Table 1. Degree Results by Gender. 2008-2009 Academic Year

		Gender		Total
		FEMALE	MALE	
Grade	Pass	5	9	14
	Distinction	1	2	3
	Fail	0	0	0
	Incomplete	2	0	2
Total		8	11	19

Table 2. Degree Results by Gender. 2001-2008 Academic Years

	FEMALE	MALE
<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
<i>2002-2003 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	2	1
Pass	6	5
Fail	0	0
<i>2001-2002 Academic Year</i>		
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
Crime, Political Ideology and Political Culture	10 (11)	63	76	68
Death Penalty	4	61	74	67
	<i>Including RM students: 5</i>	57	74	65
Desistance from Crime	4	50	72	60
	<i>Including RM students: 7</i>	50	72	62
Mafias	11	52	70	65
Law, Economics and Crime	5	66	72	69
Methods 1: Research Design and Data Collection	4	65	74	68
	<i>Including RM students: 7</i>	65	74	68
Methods II: Social Explanation and Data Analysis	2	63	68	66
	<i>Including RM students: 5</i>	48	68	63
Qualitative Methods	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<i>Including RM students: 3</i>	62	74	67
Race and Gender	10	54	72	63
Restorative Justice	11	53	77	66
Law, Economics and Crime	5	66	72	69
Prisons	13	54	75	65
Public Opinion	9	61	71	67
Sentencing	9	60	70	67
	<i>Including RM Students: 11</i>	60	72	67
Victims	2	62	68	65

Table 4. Core Course Exam results, showing the range of marks and average (Including one candidate who had retaken the exam, and all RM students)

Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average
50	75	66

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

Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average
57	74	68