

## MSc in CRIMINOLOGY and CRIMINAL JUSTICE

### REPORT OF THE EXAMINERS 2010

#### 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 (Edwin Simpson) and the Examinations Officer (Julie Bass) who were available throughout the year for support and advice.

Dedicated administrative support was received from the Criminology Graduate Studies Administrator, Ms Iris Geens, 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 Ms Geens' efficiency and professionalism throughout the year.

The Board of Examiners was supported by Professor Ben Bowling from King's College, London, who was enormously helpful in reading and commenting on essays, dissertations and examination scripts.

#### 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 six in Michaelmas and six in Hilary term). In Trinity Term, students were required to take *one* of three optional seminar courses (a fourth option was cancelled due to low subscriptions). All optional seminar courses were examined by essays, the titles of which were posted at noon on Friday of Week 6, and the essays submitted by noon on Friday of Week 9. Each essay, with the exception of the 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 that the essays were to be no less than 2,500 words and no more than 3,000 words and the candidates had to complete a number of assignments during the first six weeks of term, marked on a pass/fail basis, to the satisfaction of the course tutor.
- **Examination:** Students were required to take two Core Courses; 'Explanation and Understanding in Criminology' in Michaelmas Term, and 'Understanding Criminal Justice' in Hilary Term. These two courses were examined by one unseen three-hour

written paper on the Wednesday of Week 0 of Trinity Term (Wednesday 21 April 2010). Students were required to answer three questions from a choice of twelve. Four students missed this examination, being stranded abroad due to the Icelandic volcanic ash cloud which had grounded all planes in the UK for several weeks. In accordance with the Proctors Office's decision, however, these students had the opportunity to sit the examination at a later date. A new set of questions was approved for this separate examination which was held on Tuesday 4 May 2010.

- **Dissertation:** The students were required to submit a Dissertation of no less than 8,000 and no more than 10,000 words by noon on Friday of Week 9 of Trinity Term.

### **To pass the Examination**

The degree of MSc is awarded to any candidate who achieves a mark of at least 50 per cent for (a) the 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 six of the papers. In this calculation, both the core course and the dissertation count as two.

### **Information given to candidates**

The Edict and one Supplementary Edict (attached as Appendix 1) were sent out to candidates in Michaelmas Term 2009 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 with a mark of 49% or below would have been automatically sent to External Examiner for review, but during the academic year under review there were no such papers.

For term one, in line with previous years, all borderline papers (where a mark of 69% had been awarded) were sent to the External Examiner (there were four such essays) as well as all essays for which the assessors could not agree a mark (there was one such essay). From term two, however, following new guidelines issued by the Faculty of Law, a representative selection of coursework to be determined by the External Examiner himself was to be sent. As a result a new sampling method was devised, whereby from every course the External Examiner would receive one essay in the 50-59% range, one in the 60-69% range and one in the 69+ range. As a result, the maximum amount of essays he would receive per course was three. For courses where there is no essay in one or more of these range(s) he would of course receive fewer essays. The essays are selected at random, although care is taken that there is a spread of essays across all students as well as marks within the ranges. Altogether the External Examiner read 33 assessments (25 Essays, ~~five~~ three Core Course examinations and three Dissertations).

## **Procedures and Problems**

Due to the ban on international flights following the Icelandic volcano explosion, the Centre has had to reset the Core Course examination for four MSc students who were stranded abroad at the time of the original examination.

### **Plagiarism checks**

This was the fourth year of routine plagiarism checks in criminology. Candidates were warned in the [Course-Graduate Student Handbook](#), in the Edicts, and at a plagiarism seminar as well as at a seminar on writing skills 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 no cases of plagiarism. From the academic year 2010-2011 this system will also be applied to dissertations, as agreed by the Board of Examiners of 28 September 2009.

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

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

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

The following medical certificates were received:

- One candidate successfully applied to the Proctors for permission for late submission of their two Michaelmas Term assessed essays for medical reasons.
- One candidate successfully applied to the Proctors for permission for late submission of their Trinity Term assessed essay for medical reasons.

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

#### ***Changes enacted during 2009-2010***

During the academic year 2008-2009 the Board of Studies approved two changes to examination procedures, both of which took effect in the academic year under review.

#### *Core course exam*

The core course examination paper was divided into two sections: section A (covering criminological topics) and section B (covering criminal justice topics) and the examination rubric was amended so that candidates were required to select one

question from section A, one from section B and a third from either section. This change prevented candidates from choosing only criminology or only criminal justice questions.

#### *Requirement for a Distinction*

From October 2009 MSc students needed to achieve a distinction mark in six instead of five components of their degree to be able to achieve an overall distinction.

#### ***Change approved and enacted during 2009-2010***

Assessors introduced the practice of providing written feedback on the assessed essays. A feedback form was designed for this purpose and has been revised for 2010-2011. This was in response to a recommendation from the November 2008 Divisional Review of the MSc programs.

#### ***Changes approved during 2009-2010 for enacting during 2010-2011***

During the academic year under review the Board of Studies proposed and approved two changes to examination procedures, both of which will take effect from October 2010.

#### *Plagiarism checks for dissertations*

With the approval of Prof Dick Hobbs, the External Examiner until September 2009, the Board of Examiners had agreed to commence random plagiarism checks on dissertations from the Academic Year 2010-2011 onwards. Until now, only the end-of-term essays have been checked for plagiarism.

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

The Divisional Report of 2008 recommended that the Centre make the Michaelmas research methods course *Research Design and Data Collection* compulsory for all MSc students, not just for the students on the Research Methods version of the course. In its response to the Division's recommendations, the Centre had agreed to make this change, not least because the Board of Studies agreed that students graduating with a Masters degree in Criminology should have a basic grounding in research methods. Hence, it was decided to make this module compulsory, in addition to the two optional modules in Michaelmas Term. Given the increased workload, the Board of Studies decided to make changes to the number and nature of the assessments on this new compulsory course. Instead of two pieces of coursework handed in during term-time and assessed on a pass/fail basis, as well as a marked essay due in by Week 9, the course will from the academic year 2010-2011 be assessed by means of two term-time assessments with a word limit of 1,500-2,000 words but no end-of-term assessed essay.

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

There were fifteen candidates for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice. Moreover, two candidates completed their studies from the previous academic year (successful completion had been delayed for medical reasons in one case and the failure of one examination component in the other) and both graduated during this academic year. All new candidates passed the degree; two gained a distinction. [Of the continuing students, one gained a distinction and one a pass.](#) The only candidate with an average of over 70% (namely 70.4%), with six components at distinction level, was awarded the Roger Hood Prize, designed to recognize the best performance on the MSc

at distinction level. The recipient of the *proximae* prize obtained an overall distinction (with six components at distinction level and a weighted average of 69%). Overall the performance of the candidates was very good. Attached at Appendix 2 is the numbers of entrants, passes, distinctions and fails, broken down by gender, as well as the range of marks for each component of the course.

### **Core course examination**

The examination for the core course was taken by 15 students. The quality of the answers to this year's core course was creditable, with an overall average of 66%. None of the students failed this component and the lowest mark was 64%. One student gained a distinction.

### **Optional Courses**

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

##### *Methods I: Research Design and Data Collection (Professor Julian Roberts)*

Ten students wrote the essay for this option. Six responded to the victims' rights question, one to the question regarding a potential change in the law of murder and three attempted the design regarding the effects of home detention on co-residents of the offender. The quality of the answers was generally high. The designs proposed were innovative and reflected considerable thought on the part of the students.

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

Ten students took the class for a mark and another six audited, including one DPhil student. Three students answered the essay question on gender, five students answered the question on privatisation and two answered the question on whether or not prisons are in crisis. Marks in the course ranged from 58 to 70; one distinction was awarded. The majority of marks ranged from 60 to 69.

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

Four students submitted assessed essays: all passed. Marks ranged from 59 to 75, with two distinctions.

Two candidates answered question 1 about the influence of the standards of decency on the administration of the death penalty. One candidate answered question 2 about the place for democratic will in the administration of capital punishment, and one answered question 3 about reform and process protections to counter the human rights objections to capital punishment.

The candidate awarded a 75 had answered question 2 and had written a theoretically highly sophisticated paper which went beyond describing how democratic will influences 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 the students managed to do this, with those who reached a distinction doing it very well.

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

Both students who took the course submitted assessed essays: both passed with a high mark, averaging 67%. Both students answered question 2 on the validity of the claims of restorative justice advocates. Question 1 (on Daly's (2002) views on the place of

retribution in Restorative Justice) and question 3 (on restorative justice's influence on contemporary society's inevitable power imbalances) remained unanswered. Both essays were cross-cutting, requiring students to draw on the literature from many weeks of the course. Both students managed to do this very well. Both students also drew appropriately on the relevant theoretical and empirical literature.

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

Five students submitted essays for this option. Two students answered question 1 on positive obligations and sexual offences, and three students answered question 2 on the right of silence. The general standard was unusually high, as we had come to expect from class performances. Two Distinctions were awarded, and the other three students were only a little way below Distinction marks. This was therefore a good year for the Human Rights option.

*Desistance from Crime (Dr Ros Burnett)*

There were six candidates. Three answered question 1 and three answered question 2. For question 1, it was necessary to make a case for or against the question drawing on at least two influential theories of desistance and related empirical studies: a more sophisticated answer would be contextualised in discussion of why we need theory anyway and how theories might be evaluated. Question 2 necessitated a discussion of the “what works approaches” and the emerging “evidence” as a basis for then examining critiques that have made against this body of work; some of the essays could be improved by better development of an explicit argument fully addressing the question; while others that did reveal a clearer position in relation to the question could have been strengthened by drawing on additional angles that were covered in the course material, not least the light which desistance research throws on this question.

**Hilary Term**

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

Seven students sat this paper, six registered on the course and one took a resit. Two students attempted question 2 and five question 3. No students embarked on question 1. Two students achieved distinction level marks, the rest marks in the 60s. The highest mark was 72, the lowest 61.

*Qualitative Research Methods (Dr Mary Bosworth)*

This term candidates answered each of the three questions; only one person answered question 1; two people answered question 3 and four people answered question 2. The quality of papers was good. Two distinctions were awarded (both for question 2) and the rest of the marks fell between 60 and 68.

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

Eight students submitted papers for this option. The workload for the class also included ‘research design’ assignments and simple statistical exercises. All students handed in the assignments in time and answered the questions in full.

The exam question was formalised as follows:

“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; five chose to answer question 2; and one did question 3. The assessors were overall impressed with the range of proposals submitted and deemed that some were worthy of funding. Three candidates were awarded a Distinction.

#### *Sentencing (Prof Andrew Ashworth / Prof Julian Roberts)*

The Sentencing seminar essays were generally quite good -- reflecting the high level of class participation over the course of the individual seminars. Students split across several questions, although the highest number opted to answer the question dealing with mitigating and aggravating factors. The highest agreed mark was 74 and the lowest was 63. Overall, 4 distinctions were awarded, and the examiners did not differ appreciably on their marks.

#### *Transitional Justice (Dr Phil Clarke (CSLS) / Prof Leigh Payne (Sociology))*

Six students took the class and another nine audited, including 1 DPhil student. Three students answered the question about the production of an "official truth" in times of transition, two answered the question on holistic approaches to transitional justice, and one wrote on universal jurisdiction. Marks ranged from 61 to 70 with an average of 65. Most of the papers showed a good grasp of the key concepts and methods explored during the course; however, we felt that several of the papers suffered from unclear structuring and slight incoherence of argument, often because the students were trying to squeeze too much material into the essays.

#### *Mafias (Prof Federico Varese)*

Seven students submitted papers for this option. Four students answered question 1 (“Can a single framework explain the rise of several mafias?”) and two answered question 2 (“Which sectors of the economy are more vulnerable to mafia penetration?”). 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 two distinctions. No-one failed.

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

This option was not offered this year. The assessors reconvened to grade a re-submitted paper from a candidate who had failed to successfully complete this assignment the previous year. The candidate chose to answer question 2 (“Can Coase’s theorem be reconciled with Behavioural Law and Economics?”) and passed.

### **Trinity Term**

#### *Victims (Dr Carolyn Hoyle)*

The standard of assessed essays this year was higher than before. Seven students submitted assessed essays. All passed, three with distinction.

Three students answered question 1 on victims' participation in the sentencing process. One achieved a mid pass and two distinctions. The better papers presented sophisticated critiques of the victim participation and put their discussions in the wider context of sentencing rationales and the theoretical distinction between service and procedural rights. The other paper had gone beyond the prescribed readings but failed to provide the appropriate context for the debate about the pros and cons of victim impact evidence.

Four candidates answered question 2 on equality and 'ideal victims'. All the responses except one were mid to high passes; the fourth candidate gained the top distinction for an excellent analysis of the concept of equality at the various stages of the criminal process and a sophisticated understanding of the different experiences and prospect of victimisation. It was, furthermore, very well written and structured. The other candidates covered the main ground but either did not write as well as other candidates or failed adequately to relate the points made back to the question.

No one attempted the third question: 'What do victim policy reforms over the past decade tell us about the changing relationship between the citizen and the state?'

All of the essay questions were cross-cutting, requiring students to draw on the literature from more than one week of the course. All students rose to this challenge.

#### *Risk, Security and Criminal Justice (Prof Lucia Zedner)*

Twelve candidates took this option, one of whom had dispensation from the Proctors to submit after the deadline. All but one candidate answered the second or third questions (with candidates being almost equally divided between the two). All the essays were of a very good standard. The weaker essays suffered from a lack of clear structure and a corresponding lack of a clear line of argument. They also tended to report and describe rather than to analyse and engage with the literature. The better essays demonstrated a stronger grasp of the issues, a willingness to engage with debates, and to use the material to answer the question directly. They evidenced wide-reading, sound research and a strong grasp of the relevant academic debates. The very best essays were really impressive. They were sophisticated in their analysis of the issues and made a really determined effort to answer the question. They were clearly organised, engaging to read, and demonstrated a powerful grasp of the issues in play.

#### *Sociology of Punishment (Dr Mary Bosworth)*

All the papers were good. Students answered two of the three questions, number 1 (Whose interests does state punishment serve?) and number 3 (How, if at all, does the sociology of punishment equip criminologists to address contemporary practices of punishment?), with the majority selecting the first question. Nobody chose the second essay question on how useful the notion of 'penal populism' is for understanding punishment. Two distinction marks were awarded.

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

This module was cancelled as only one student had elected to take it.

## **Dissertations**

The range of topics was wide and interesting. All candidates presented well-researched and well-written papers. All passed, with five obtaining distinctions. One student was awarded a grade in the fifties, with the second lowest mark being 64%. The distinctions were characterized by extensive reading, effective engagement with the research literature, and a clear ability to mount, sustain, and substantiate a coherent argument.

B. Bowling (External)  
F. Varese (Chair)  
I. Loader  
J. Roberts  
July 2010

## Appendix 1

# IMPORTANT – TO BE RETAINED FOR FUTURE REFERENCE

## FACULTY OF LAW UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

### MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice NOTICE TO CANDIDATES 2009-2010

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 Federico Varese) 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 2009**

**Friday 20<sup>th</sup> November 2009 (Noon):** Essay titles shall be posted on the Graduate Student Noticeboard at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by e-mail.

**Friday 11<sup>th</sup> December 2009 (Noon):** Students must submit the required work to the Clerk of Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

##### **Hilary Term 2010**

**Friday 26<sup>th</sup> February 2010 (Noon):** Essay titles shall be posted on the Graduate Student Noticeboard at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by email.

**Friday 19<sup>th</sup> March 2010 (Noon):** Students must submit the required work to the Clerk of the Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

## Trinity Term 2010

**Friday 4<sup>th</sup> June 2010 (Noon):** Essay titles shall be posted on the Graduate Student Noticeboard at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by email.

**Friday 25<sup>th</sup> June 2010 (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’) 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’ 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. In addition, candidates taking any of these three options shall be required to complete to the satisfaction of the option course leader any assessments set during the term, which will be approved by the Board of Studies and the details of which will be given to the students at the start of the term. 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). Late submission of this Declaration may lead the Proctors’ Office to recommend an academic penalty (see Examination Regulations 2009, pages 46-47, Part 16.8.(6)).

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

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

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

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

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

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

Factors (2) – (4) may require a final decision on penalty to be delayed until all the marks for the degree examination are known. See further Examination Regulations 2009,

pp. 46-47, para. 16.8. Candidates should consult their college adviser if any of these provisions apply to them. See also Section B.5 below (third paragraph).

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

#### ***4. Length***

Candidates should take seriously the word limits imposed (both upper and lower). If a candidate exceeds the word limit, the examiners may decide not to proceed with the examination of the work. If they do proceed, they may reduce the mark by up to one class (or its equivalent). See further Examination Regulations 2009, pp. 44-45, para. 16.6.

#### ***5. Plagiarism***

Plagiarism is “the wrongful appropriation or purloining, and publication as one’s own, of the ideas, or the expression of the ideas of another” (OED). All published and unpublished material, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, is covered under this description. The Proctors’ Disciplinary Regulations concerning conduct in examinations (see Examination Regulations 2009, Part 19.4. and 19.5, p. 52) state that ‘No candidate shall present for an examination as his or her own work any part of the substance of another person’s work. In any written work (whether thesis, dissertation, essay, coursework, or written examination) passages quoted or closely paraphrased from another person’s work must be identified as quotations or paraphrases, and the source of the quoted or paraphrased material must be clearly acknowledged.’ In all written work students must be vigilant in citing the work they have referred to or quoted from. (Please see further **Appendix D**). Examples of plagiarism and detailed advice as to how to avoid it are given on <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/epsc/plagiarism/index.shtml>; you are strongly advised to consult this website. Academic supervisors can provide practical guidance on providing references and bibliographies for your work. The University reserves the right to use software applications to screen any individual’s submitted work for matches either to published sources or to other submitted work. Any such matches respectively might indicate either plagiarism or collusion. In this connection, you are required to complete and submit with each essay a **Declaration of Authorship**, including acknowledgement of the University’s right to check for plagiarism or collusion. A blank Declaration of Authorship for your use is on the MSc website: <http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/MSC/generalinformation.htm>.

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

Late submission of this Declaration may lead the Proctors’ Office to recommend an academic penalty (see Examination Regulations 2009, pages 46-47, Part 16.8.(6)).

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

## **6. Results**

The Examiners hope to be able to publish the results of the Michaelmas Term essays by Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2009, the results of the Hilary Term essays by Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> April 2009 and the results of the Trinity Term essays by Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2010 (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 **Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> April 2010**. 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) Reference materials**

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

The use of bilingual dictionaries by non-native English speakers is under review by the Education Committee. When available, further information will be circulated to candidates.

##### **(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.

## ***4. Scripts***

### **(i) Anonymity**

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

### **(ii) Legibility**

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

### **(iii) Handing in scripts**

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

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

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

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

Candidates who fail to attend a written examination paper without having obtained the prior permission of the Proctors are deemed to have failed the entire examination (not just that particular unit of the examination) unless the Proctors give instructions to the Examiners about reinstating them (Examination Regulations 2009, 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 2009, 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 approximately twelve questions on the Core Course paper, which is divided into two sections. Candidates must answer THREE questions, at least one from each section.

### ***7. Marking***

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

### ***8. Results***

The Core Course paper will be marked, alongside the Trinity Term essays and the Dissertation, in June. The Examiners hope to be able to publish the results by Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2010.

### ***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 6<sup>th</sup> November 2009 (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 2009, 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 26<sup>th</sup> February 2010 (noon):** Students must submit the title of their proposed dissertation to the Graduate Studies Administrator by email.

**Friday 12<sup>th</sup> March 2010:** 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 25<sup>th</sup> June 2010 (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 2009, pp. 44-45, para. 16.6.

### 3. *Method of Assessment*

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

### 4. *Submission of Dissertation*

Candidates shall be required to submit **two typewritten copies** of the Dissertation. The Dissertation must be typed or printed on one side of A4 paper only, with a margin of 3 to 3.5 centimeters on the left-hand side of each page. The text should be double-spaced and the footnotes and quotations should be single-spaced. Pages should be numbered and **EACH page should record your examination number and the dissertation title in a header or footer box**. Candidates must **not** write their name or College anywhere on the Dissertation or envelope. The Dissertation should be bound or stapled, not held together by a paper clip. All written work must be submitted in English. For definitive guidance on the correct format for a dissertation please refer to **Appendix E**, and see also Section 7.7 of the MSc Student Handbook 2009-2010 for further details.

The Dissertation should have a cover sheet attached to it containing the title, subtitle (if any) and examination number. It should also state the Oxford term and year of submission and the number of words (*inclusive of footnotes and appendices, but excluding the abstract, table of contents, table of cases, table of statutes, the bibliography, any headers and footers and index*). You will find copies of these cover sheets for your use on the MSc website: <http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/MSc/generalinformation.htm>. In addition, the Dissertation must be accompanied by a declaration that 'This Dissertation is

the candidate's own work. No part of it has already been accepted, nor has it been currently submitted, for a degree of this University or elsewhere.' To assist you, this declaration has been incorporated into the **Declaration of Authorship** you are required to submit (see further C.6. below). Late submission of this Declaration may lead the Proctors' Office to recommend an academic penalty (see Examination Regulations 2009, pages 46-47, Part 16.8.(6)).

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

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

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 2009, pp. 46-47, para. 16.8. Candidates should consult their college adviser if any of these provisions apply to them. See also Section B.5. 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, pp. 44-45 para. 16.6.

## ***6. Plagiarism***

Plagiarism is “the wrongful appropriation or purloining, and publication as one’s own, of the ideas, or the expression of the ideas of another” (OED). All published and unpublished material, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, is covered under this description. The Proctors’ Disciplinary Regulations concerning conduct in examinations (see Examination Regulations 2009, Part 19.4 and 19.5. p. 52) state that ‘No candidate shall present for an examination as his or her own work any part of the substance of another person’s work. In any written work (whether thesis, dissertation, essay, coursework, or written examination) passages quoted or closely paraphrased from another person’s work must be identified as quotations or paraphrases, and the source of the quoted or paraphrased material must be clearly acknowledged.’ In all written work students must be vigilant in citing the work they have referred to or quoted from (please see further **Appendix D**). Examples of plagiarism and detailed advice as to how to avoid it are given on <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/epsc/plagiarism/index.shtml>; you are strongly advised to consult this website. Academic supervisors can provide practical guidance on providing references and bibliographies for your work. The University reserves the right to use software applications to screen any individual’s submitted work for matches either to published sources or to other submitted work. In this connection, you are required to complete and submit with the Dissertation a **Declaration of Authorship**, including acknowledgement of the University’s right to check for plagiarism or collusion. A blank Declaration of Authorship for your use is on the MSc website: <http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/MSC/generalinformation.htm>.

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

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

Late submission of this Declaration may lead the Proctors’ Office to recommend an academic penalty (see Examination Regulations 2009, pages 46-47, Part 16.8.(6)).

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

## ***7. Results***

The Examiners hope to be able to publish the dissertation results **by Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2010** (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 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 six of the papers; in this calculation, both the core course and the dissertation count as two papers.

The Examiners hope to publish the final results by Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2010. Candidates can 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/current\\_students/student\\_information.html](http://www.ox.ac.uk/current_students/student_information.html). Informal individual transcripts (giving the breakdown of marks) will be mailed direct to candidates at their colleges once the final marks are published.

## **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.

**B. Bowling (External Examiner)**

**F. Varese (Chair)**

**I. Loader**

**J. Roberts**

**1 October 2009**

~~IMPORTANT — TO BE RETAINED FOR FUTURE REFERENCE~~

~~FACULTY OF LAW~~

~~UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD~~

~~MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice~~

~~SECOND NOTICE TO CANDIDATES 2009-2010~~

~~Amendment to Notice to Candidates (Examiners' Edict) (dated 1 October 2009)~~

~~Use of Dictionaries in the Examination Room~~

~~There has been a change in regulation for candidates whose course of study commenced in Michaelmas Term 2009 regarding the use of bilingual dictionaries in the examination room (see *Examination Regulations 2009*, Part 13, 13.7 (page 39) and the Notice to Candidates (Examiners' Edict) dated 1 October 2009). The information regarding the use of bilingual dictionaries in the examination room given in the Notice to Candidates (dated 1 October 2009) should accordingly be replaced with the following:~~

~~Examiners' Edict, page 6:~~

~~3. Materials in the Examination Room~~

~~(i) Reference materials~~

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

~~Following the review by the Education Committee no dictionaries are allowed in the examination room.~~

~~F. Varese~~

~~Chair of Examiners~~

~~12 January 2010~~

# Appendix A

## MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice 2009-2010

### 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 2009, Part 19, pages 51-53) **and the Proctors' Administrative Regulations for Candidates in Examinations** (see Examination Regulations 2009, Part 20, pages 53-54).

1. Please check that you are seated at the right seat in the examination room.
2. In order to prevent impersonation of examination candidates, during every written paper you must display your University Card face up on the desk at which you are writing.
3. Do not turn over the examination paper or begin writing until you are told you may do so.
4. You may remove gowns, jackets and ties during the examination, but you must be correctly dressed in *subfusc.* before you leave the examination room.
5. Do not put your name or college on any answer book. Write only "MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice", the title of the paper ("Core Course") and your examination number in the spaces provided.
6. Please read the instructions on the front of your answer book and observe them.
7. You may not leave the examination room before 30 minutes after the beginning of the examination, nor in the last 30 minutes of the examination.
8. Do not bring refreshments into the examination room. Water is available in the lobby just outside the room. It is not to be brought into the room. If you would like a drink of water or to visit the lavatory please contact one of the invigilators by raising your hand.
9. Do not bring mobile telephones or any other electronic devices into the examination room.
10. Do not bring any papers 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 2009-2010**

#### **MARKING CONVENTIONS**

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

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

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

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

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

# Appendix C

## MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice 2009-2010

### 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’**

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

|

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

**FACULTY OF LAW**  
**UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD**

**MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice**

**SECOND NOTICE TO CANDIDATES 2009-2010**

**Amendment to Notice to Candidates (Examiners' Edict) (dated 1 October 2009)**

**Use of Dictionaries in the Examination Room**

There has been a change in regulation for candidates whose course of study commenced in Michaelmas Term 2009 regarding the use of bilingual dictionaries in the examination room (see *Examination Regulations 2009*, Part 13, 13.7 (page 39) and the Notice to Candidates (Examiners' Edict) dated 1 October 2009). The information regarding the use of bilingual dictionaries in the examination room given in the Notice to Candidates (dated 1 October 2009) should accordingly be replaced with the following:

**Examiners' Edict, page 6:**

**3. Materials in the Examination Room**

**(i) Reference materials**

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

Following the review by the Education Committee **no** dictionaries are allowed in the examination room.

F. Varese  
Chair of Examiners  
12 January 2010

## Appendix 2.

### MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice

Table 1. Degree Results by Gender. 2009-2010 Academic Year

		FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL
Grade	Pass	12 (incl 1 deferred from 2008-9)	2	14
	Distinction	1 (deferred from 2008-9)	2	3
	Fail	0	0	0
Total		13	4	17

Table 2. Degree Results by Gender. 2001-2009 Academic Years

	FEMALE	MALE
<i>2008-9 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	2
Pass	5	9
Fail	0	0
Deferred	2	0
<i>2007-8 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	2
Pass	10	5
Fail	0	0
<i>2006-7 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	3
Pass	7	5
Fail	0	1
<i>2005-6 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	3	3
Pass	6	4
Fail	2	0
<i>2004-2005 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	2	2
Pass	6	4
Fail	0	0
<i>2003-2004 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	2
Pass	4	4
Fail	0	0
<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
Death Penalty	4	59	75	67
Human Rights and Criminal Justice	5	66	73	69
Desistance from Crime	6	58	75	65
Prisons	10	58	70	65
Mafias	7	55	70	65
Law, Economics and Crime	1 (resit)	55	55	55
Transitional Justice	6	61	70	66
Crime, Political Ideology and Political Culture	7	61	72	66
Methods I: Research Design and Data Collection	3	64	68	66
	<i>Including RM students: 8</i>	64	72	68
Methods II: Social Explanation and Data Analysis	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<i>Including RM students: 5</i>	62	75	68
Qualitative Methods	1	64	64	64
	<i>Including RM students: 6</i>	60	73	66
Race and Gender	N/A (not run due to only one student registered on it).			
Restorative Justice	2	66	68	67
Sentencing	10	60	74	68
Risk, Security and Criminal Justice	7	64	72	67
	<i>Including RM Students: 12</i>	63	70	66
Sociology of Punishment	4	65	70	65
	<i>Including RM Students: 6</i>	64	75	68
Victims	4	63	73	70
	<i>Including RM Students: 7</i>	63	73	68

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
55	72	66

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

Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average
56	74	63