

## MSc in CRIMINOLOGY and CRIMINAL JUSTICE

### REPORT OF THE EXAMINERS 2013

#### General Remarks

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

The Board of Examiners was supported by Professor Shadd Maruna, Queens' University, Belfast, who was enormously helpful in reading and commenting on essays, dissertations and examination scripts. The Board records its thanks to Professor Maruna for his assistance.

#### Structure of the Examination

The elements of the examination were as follows:

- **Option essays:** In each of Michaelmas and Hilary Terms, students were required to take *two* optional seminar-based courses (out of a choice of five in Michaelmas and Hilary Term). In Trinity Term, students were required to take *one* of a choice of four optional seminar-based courses. All optional courses were examined by essays, the titles of which were posted at noon on Friday of Week 6, and the essays submitted by noon on Friday of Week 9. Each essay, with the exception of the three methods option courses (Social Explanation and Data Analysis, Quantitative Analysis and Qualitative Methods) was to be no less than 3,500 and no more than 5,000 words. In all options the candidates chose one essay question from a choice of three. The 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.
- **Research Design and Data Collection 'in term' essays:** This compulsory research methods course taught in Michaelmas Term was examined by the successful completion of a pass/fail essay submitted in week 6 and one graded essay of 2500 – 3000 words to be submitted by week 9.

- **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 (Friday 19th April 2013). Students were required to answer three questions from a choice of twelve; at least one of which was to be answered from each of the two parts of the exam paper.
- **Dissertation:** The students were required to submit a Dissertation of no less than 8,000 and no more than 10,000 words by noon on Friday of Week 9 of Trinity Term.

### **To pass the Examination**

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

### **Information given to candidates**

The Edict (attached at Appendix 1) was sent out to candidates in Michaelmas Term 2012 in hard and electronic copy. The Edict was also available on the MSc Criminology intranet pages. Much of this information had already been available to candidates in the MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice handbook, and the programme specifications (all students received a hard copy of these documents upon enrolment and they are also available on the intranet).

### **Marking**

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

Following the Faculty of Law guidelines, a representative selection of coursework was sent to the External Examiner. The essays are selected at random, although care is taken that there is a spread of essays across all students as well as marks within the ranges. All papers with a mark of 49% or below are sent to the External Examiner for review. During 2012-2013 there were no such papers. Altogether the External Examiner read 51 assessments (45 essays, three Core Course examinations and three Dissertations). This was a reduction of 11 assessments from last year.

## **Procedures and Problems**

During the academic year under review, the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice and the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice (Research Methods) together received nine submissions to the Proctors under *Examinations Regulations*, Regulations for the Conduct of University Examinations, Part 11, clauses 11.8 to 11.10. Such submissions are made “[i]f it comes to the notice of a candidate’s college before, during or after an examination that the candidate’s performance in any part of a University Examination is likely to be or has been affected by factors of which the examiners have no knowledge” (Examination Regulations 2010, p 34) and, when approved by the proctors, allow the Board of Examiners to take “such action as the Examiners may think suitable”. In total there were six such submissions in relation to five individual candidates, a reduction from last year. These submissions were discussed by the Board in some detail and judgements made about the candidates’ results.

### *Plagiarism checks for dissertations and essays*

This was the 7th year of routine plagiarism checks in criminology. The plagiarism checks included dissertations, as well as assessed essays. Candidates were warned in the Graduate Student Handbook, in the Edicts, and at a plagiarism seminar as well as at a seminar on writing skills for assessments, that a random sample of essays and dissertations would be checked for plagiarism. Accordingly, they were asked to submit electronically a copy of each of their essays and of their dissertation to the Graduate Studies Administrator at the same time as they submitted a hard copy to the Examination Schools. As agreed by The Board of Examiners in TT 2012 the sampled essays and dissertations were checked for evidence of plagiarism using Turnitin by the GSA, Ms Tracy Kaye, with any cases then forwarded to the examiners. One candidate’s essay showed an exceptionally high level of matches through Turnitin and was referred to the Proctor who is currently reviewing the case. This candidate’s final results have not been released pending the Proctor’s decision.

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

During the academic year under review the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice, and the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice (Research Methods) together had two candidates registered with the Disability Advisory Service for disability-related matters. One candidate received access to a word processor for their Core Course Examination in Trinity Term and the other extra time during the examination.

The two MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice programmes together had nine requests from six students which is an increase on last year when six such permissions were made for five individual candidates. These extensions were requested (and all granted) for health reasons.

- One candidate received and extension in Michaelmas Term for one essay.
- One candidate received and extension in Trinity Term for one essay.
- One candidate received extensions for one assessment for each of Michaelmas, Hilary and Trinity Terms
- One candidate received extensions for their assessments in both Michaelmas and Trinity Term due to a recurring medical problem.
- Two candidates received extensions for both of their Hilary Term essays due to health reasons.
- Two candidates received an extension for their Trinity Term dissertation due to health issues.

## **Changes to the Examination Rubric**

### ***Changes enacted during 2012-2013***

The assessment of 'Research Design and Data Collection' reverted to the structure adopted prior to 2010/11 to comprise one term-time 1,500 word assignment (to be submitted by noon on Friday of Week 6 and assessed on a pass/fail basis) and one end-of-term 2,500- 3000 word assessed essay (to be submitted by noon on Friday of Week 9, with the choice of essay questions released by noon on Friday of Week 6).

### ***Feedback to students***

The issue of giving MSc students feedback on their assessed essays and dissertations after each Board was raised in Michaelmas Term 2012 by the Proctors. Despite students being provided with feedback on essays and dissertations for a number of years, and this provision being included in the student handbook and exam regulations, the proctors queried the procedure and considered whether this should continue. The proctors were concerned that marks released in January for the MT assessments were interim and not formally ratified. This matter was resolved in time for feedback to be given to students on their MT marks after the Board at the start of Hilary Term. It was agreed that marks from each Board would be considered final (and therefore not subject to final approval at the July Exam Board) and that the Chair would agree the marks by telephone with the external examiner if he was not present at the Board before they were released to the students along with feedback.

## **Overall Results of the Examination**

There were twenty-six candidates for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice. Twenty four candidates passed the degree; with five gaining a distinction. One candidate is submitting the final essay and dissertation in November 2013, so the result is not yet known, and one other candidate is under review with the Proctors for possible plagiarism. The candidate with the highest average achieved 71.9% with seven components at distinction level and 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 a distinction (with seven components at distinction level and a weighted average of 70.9%). Overall the performance of the candidates was very good. Attached at Appendix 2 is the numbers of entrants, passes, distinctions and fails, broken down by gender, as well as the range of marks for each component of the course.

### **Core course examination**

Twenty-six students sat the exam, which had two sections, each comprising six questions. Students had to answer at least one question from each section and a third one from either section. Marks ranged from 56% to 74%. Seven students were awarded distinction marks. 18 students were awarded marks in the 60s. One student was awarded a mark below 60%..

## **Optional Courses**

### ***Michaelmas Term***

## **Public and Private Policing** Ben Bradford

A total of ten students took the exam. The papers were generally of a good quality, and marks ranged from a low of 62 to a high of 74. Two students were awarded distinction level grades (74 and 73), and there was one near miss (69).

The number of students answering each essay question is shown below.

1. Does the growth of private policing mean that security is becoming a commodity like any other? **Four**
2. In what ways might excessive use of surveillance technology by the public police undermine legitimacy and cooperation? **Four**
3. Will the introduction of Police and Crime Commissioners in England and Wales make the police more accountable to the public? **Two**

## **Social Explanation and Data Analysis Ben Bradford**

A total of eleven students took the assessment, three on a pass/fail basis. The papers were generally of a good quality, although none of the eight given a grade were awarded a distinction. Among this group, marks ranged from a low of 64 to a high of 69 (the range of marks was dampened by the joint marking process). All the students who submitted on a pass/fail basis were given a pass, and one of these papers would have been awarded a distinction if a grade had been given.

The number of students answering each essay question is shown below.

1. Critically assess a purely quantitative approach to the investigation of trust and legitimacy in the policing contest. **Three**
2. To what extent is it possible or desirable to identify a single cause of crime? Discuss with reference to the decline in crime in America since the 1990s. **Six**
3. Which comes first in research, theory or empirical observation? And why? **Two**

## **Prisons. Mary Bosworth**

14 students took the prisons course. The essays this term were of particularly high quality -- with 5 distinctions awarded in total. Students favoured question 2 (about gender), with 8 of them answering that question, four answered question 1 and only two wrote about question 3. All candidates passed, with marks ranging from 50 - 75.

## **Victims & Restorative Justice Carolyn Hoyle**

Sixteen candidates entered for this assessment. Two candidates answered question 1 on the potential of restorative justice to decentre the notion of crime. This was a difficult question and as is often the case the candidates who chooses the most difficult question wrote excellent papers, both at distinction level.

Two answered question 3 about equal rights to allocation in the criminal justice process, one received a high pass, the other a distinction. The majority of candidates however, answered question 2 about the prospects for justice for those who live side by side with their aggressors. While one candidate chose to answer this in relation to both crimes against humanity and domestic abuse, the vast majority chose to focus on one or the other. These papers ranged from low passes to clear distinctions (there were 4 distinctions). Those who achieved high marks did so for critical engagement with the academic literature, clear, coherent writing and theoretical sophistication. Those papers that described, rather than analysing the relevant literature and debates received lower grades. Finally, many of the candidates that answered this question failed to address the issue of proximity. They took it at face value that domestic abuse and crimes against humanity happened where victims and offenders were living in close proximity rather than distinguishing cases where this would be so from those where it was not as likely. For example, in the main candidates writing about domestic abuse failed to distinguish between cases where the parties are separated and those where they remain living together. Similarly, proximity played out differently in Rwanda than in Kosovo, for example. As usual, those candidates who wrote well, providing a clear structure, roadmap and signposting for their papers received better marks than those with errors of syntax or weak structure.

## **Death Penalty** Carolyn Hoyle

Six candidates entered for this assessment.

One candidate answered question on contemporary efforts to regulate the death penalty; two candidates answered question 2 on the prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment post Furman; and three candidates answered question 3 on the innocence movement.

The marks ranged from a low pass, through solid/high passes and three distinctions. This is a much higher proportion of distinctions and reflects considerable effort by these candidates. The distinctions were awarded for papers that were theoretically very sophisticated, that critically engaged with, rather than merely describing the literature and that were analytical. Indeed, one of the papers was of publishable quality; a truly superb piece of writing.

As usual, those candidates who wrote well, providing a clear structure, roadmap and signposting for their papers received better marks than those with errors of syntax or weak structure.

## **Research Design and Data Collection** Julian Roberts

There were 27 students writing the essay which required them to design a research project. They were given a choice of 3 designs. One was to test the hypothesis that parole works, the second was to explore the extent of racial abuse in prisons and the third to test the hypothesis that giving crime victims more input into the sentencing process would promote victim satisfaction. The parole design attracted the most answers, two thirds of the group elected to design such a study. The victim hypothesis was the least popular, attracting only 15% and the remainder answering the prison question. The responses were well conceived and in some cases quite imaginative. Most students had taken on board the need for both qualitative and quantitative components and the need for multiple dependent variables -- two important lessons from the course. The overall quality of the answers was therefore quite high, with the average mark across the group being a 66. All students passed the term time 1500 word assessment.

## **Hilary Term**

### **Crime and the Media** - Dr Marianne Colbran

There were 12 candidates taking this course.

**Question 1.** Critically evaluate the claim that in relations between the police and the media, the balance of power is always skewed in favour of the media. 6 candidates answered this question. There was one Distinction, one Strong Pass, three Good Passes and one Pass.

**Question 2.** It has been argued that the creation of crime news is a product of the cultural and social organisation of news work and not of events in the world. Discuss this assertion with reference to media coverage of crime and policing. 3 candidates answered this question. There was one Strong Pass and two Good Passes.

**Question 3.** "Cultural myths powerfully help to shape our perceptions of law and order, safety and security, of victims and perpetrators: their veracity is of not much consequence..." (Campbell 2010:111). Discuss this assertion in the context of depiction

of crime and policing in either television police dramas or crime films.3 candidates answered this question. There were two Strong Passes and one Pass.

### **Human Rights** Professor Andrew Ashworth

Eight candidates completed this option and submitted an assessed essay. The class had been relatively quiet this year, and I was unsure how good some candidates actually were. The essays revealed a commendably high standard of analysis, and consequently the marks were relatively high this year. Five of the assessed essays tackled Q.2 on evidence obtained by breach of Article 3; two tackled Q.3, on Article 5 and policing; and the remaining candidate tackled the more abstract topic of the European Court's approach to autonomous meanings. Overall, the law was handled well, the case-law of the Court was used to good effect, and candidates showed an ability to place the legal issues in a broader criminal justice context.

### **Quantitative Analysis for Criminology: Introduction to Statistics and SPSS –** Dr Ben Bradford

A total of 13 students took the assessment. The range of marks awarded was relatively broad: the lowest was 53, while the highest was 72. However, the marks were very satisfactory overall, with ten candidates achieving a 65 or above and four achieving a distinction level grade. All three questions were answered by a number of candidates, although question one (relating to police stops of cars) proved somewhat less popular than the others.

### **Trinity Term**

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

Four students submitted essays in the sociology of punishment. We awarded one distinction and the rest were in the mid-60s. All of the essays questions were attempted. the quality was good.

- 'To what extent does punishment presuppose and reinforce solidarity?' One student
- 'How, if at all, would greater attention to race, gender and/or citizenship alter the sociology of punishment?' Two students
- Can any Single Theoretical Perspective Satisfactorily Explain Punishment? One student.

#### **Comparative Criminal Justice** Prof David Nelken,

This year there were two students ( plus one auditing some lessons). They chose various questions from the examination , one was a strong candidate and wrote well; the other candidate was weaker.

#### **Sentencing – Prof Andrew Ashworth, Prof Julian Roberts**

The seminar had been well-attended and the participation frequent and of a high quality so it was unsurprising that the essays submitted for the seminar were in general well-written and thoughtful responses to the essay questions. In all there were 11 essays submitted for examining. Five of the essays attracted a distinction mark and three more were quite close to the distinction mark, achieving a mark of 68. In the end however the examiners felt that these three papers fell somewhat short of the level of analysis that would be expected of an essay attracting a distinction. Of the distinction level essays the

top two attained a mark of 74 and were thoughtful and well-researched essays. Only one of the essays fell beneath the 60 threshold and even this one attracted a mark close to the threshold, namely 58.

**Crime, political culture and political ideologies – Prof Ian Loader**

10 candidates were assessed for this option. Each of the three set questions was attempted by at least two candidates. The marks awarded ranged from 60 to 70. Two distinction marks of 70 were awarded.

**Dissertations**

One candidate failed to submit a dissertation having submitted an abbreviated dissertation in 2012 and been given permission to resubmit in 2013. One candidate is due to submit their dissertation in November 2013 and one candidate's submission is currently with the Proctors. All others submitted on time.

The range of topics was wide and interesting. Most candidates presented well-researched and well-written papers. All other students passed, with nine obtaining distinctions. Two students were awarded a grade of 58%, all others being 60% or above

S. MARUNA (External)  
R Condry (Chair)  
J Roberts  
M Bosworth  
25 September 2013

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

**FACULTY OF LAW  
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD**

**MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice  
NOTICE TO CANDIDATES 2012-2013**

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/current/1213\\_MScEdict.pdf](http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/current/1213_MScEdict.pdf). If you believe that it may contain an error, please notify the Chair of Examiners (Dr Rachel Condry) without delay.

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

**A. Information for Candidates regarding the Papers for the Methods Courses and the Assessed Essays for the Options**

***1. Timing***

**Michaelmas Term 2012**

**Friday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2012 (Noon):** Essay titles shall be posted on the Graduate Student Noticeboard at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by email.

**Friday 7<sup>th</sup> December 2012 (Noon):** Candidates must submit the required work to the Clerk of Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

## **Hilary Term 2013**

**Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2013 (Noon):** Essay titles shall be posted on the Graduate Student Noticeboard at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by email.

**Friday 15<sup>th</sup> March 2013 (Noon):** Candidates must submit the required work to the Clerk of the Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

## **Trinity Term 2013**

**Friday 31<sup>st</sup> May 2013 (Noon):** Essay titles shall be posted on the Graduate Student Noticeboard at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by email.

**Friday 21<sup>st</sup> June 2013 (Noon):** Candidates must submit the required work to the Clerk of the Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

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

All courses (other than ‘Research Design and Data Collection’, ‘Social Explanation and Data Analysis’, ‘Statistical Methods for Social Scientists’ 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.

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

## ***3. Submission of Written Work***

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

Each essay should have a cover sheet attached to it containing the title and examination number. It should also state the Oxford term and year of submission and the number of

words (inclusive of footnotes, but excluding bibliography and appendices). You will find copies of these cover sheets for your use on the MSc website: <http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/current/assessedessays.php>. In addition, each essay must be accompanied by a declaration that ‘This essay is the candidate’s own work. No part of it has already been accepted, nor has it been currently submitted, for a degree of this University or elsewhere.’ To assist you, this declaration has been incorporated into the **Declaration of Authorship** you are required to submit (see further A.5. below). Late submission of this Declaration may lead the Proctors’ Office to recommend an academic penalty (see Examination Regulations 2012, pages 45-46 Part 16.8.(6)).

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

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

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

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

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

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

Factors (2) – (4) may require a final decision on penalty to be delayed until all the marks for the degree examination are known. See further Examination Regulations 2012, pages

45-46 Part 16.8. Candidates should consult their College Advisor if any of these provisions apply to them. See also Section B.5 below (third paragraph).

A candidate who fails to apply for or to obtain permission from the Proctors for the late submission of any assessed essays, or non-submission (i.e. withdrawal from this examination unit (see Section B.5. below)), will be deemed to have failed the unit(s) in question. Non-submission includes where the Examiners refuse to examine work which exceeds the word limit (see Section A.4. below). Candidates are reminded that they must pass in all assessment areas in order to pass the degree (see Section D Overall Assessment and Publication of Results, below).

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

Candidates should take seriously the word limits imposed (both upper and lower). If a candidate exceeds the word limit, the examiners may decide not to proceed with the examination of the work. If they do proceed, they may reduce the mark by up to one class (or its equivalent). See further Examination Regulations 2012, pp. 44, para. 16.6. Those who write less than the lower limit may likewise be penalized.

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

Plagiarism is “the wrongful appropriation or purloining, and publication as one’s own, of the ideas, or the expression of the ideas of another” (OED). All published and unpublished material, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, is covered under this description. The Proctors’ Disciplinary Regulations concerning conduct in examinations (see Examination Regulations 2012, 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/edc/goodpractice/>; you are strongly advised to consult this website. Academic supervisors can provide practical guidance on providing references and bibliographies for your work. The University reserves the right to use software applications to screen any individual’s submitted work for matches either to published sources or to other submitted work. Any such matches respectively might indicate either plagiarism or collusion. In this connection, you are required to complete and submit with each essay a **Declaration of Authorship**, including acknowledgement of the University’s right to check for plagiarism or collusion. A blank Declaration of Authorship for your use is on the MSc website: <http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/current/assessedessays.php> .

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 2012, pages 45-46, 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 18<sup>th</sup> January 2013, the results of the Hilary Term essays by Friday 26<sup>th</sup> April 2013 and the results of the Trinity Term essays by Friday 19<sup>th</sup> July 2013 (i.e. the date upon which the Final Results are to be published).

### **B. Information for Candidates regarding the Core Course Examination**

#### ***1. Time of Examination***

This year the MSc written examination for the Joint Core Course 'Explanation and Understanding in Criminology and Understanding Criminal Justice' is scheduled to take place in Week 0 of Trinity Term, provisionally on **Thursday 18<sup>th</sup> April 2013**. The date and time will be confirmed in the Examination Timetable, to be published online at <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/schools/oxonly/timetables/index.shtml>, no later than five weeks prior to the examination. Hard copies of each candidate's personal timetable will be sent to their college by the Examination Schools shortly after the full timetable appears on the website.

#### ***2. Place of Examinations and Time of Arrival***

The Examination will take place in the Examinations Schools in the High Street. *Subfusc.* must be worn. You are advised to reach the Schools no less than ten minutes before the stated time of the examination. Notices in the waiting area will inform you which room and desk number you are allocated to. Desks are listed by number and lists are displayed outside each exam room to remind you which desk number you have been allocated.

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

It is essential that you take your university ID card with you for all exams. If you lose your card you should your college office immediately to order a replacement. This must be placed face up on the desk at which you are writing.

### ***3. Materials in the Examination Room***

#### **(i) Reference materials**

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

#### **(ii) Rough work**

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

#### **(iii) Water and medication**

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

### ***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 2012, 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 before the examination and after the examination has started, see the Examination Regulations 2012, pp. 39-40, Part 14.

### ***6. Special remarks concerning the paper***

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

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

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

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

The Core Course paper will be marked, alongside the Trinity Term essays and the Dissertation, in June. The Examiners hope to be able to publish the results by Friday 19<sup>th</sup> July 2013.

### ***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 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2012 (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 2012, pp. 32–35, part 11. The Examiners cannot take account of any special circumstances other than those communicated by the Proctors. See also Section B.5 above.

## **C. Information for Candidates regarding the Dissertation**

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

#### **Hilary Term**

**Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> February 2013 (noon):** Candidates must submit the title of their proposed dissertation to the Graduate Studies Administrator by email.

**Friday 8<sup>th</sup> March 2013:** Candidates will be informed by this date whether their titles have been approved and will be given the name of their Dissertation Supervisor.

#### **Trinity Term**

**Friday 21<sup>st</sup> June 2013 (Noon):** Candidates must submit the Dissertation to the Clerk of the Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

### ***2. Change of Title***

A request to change the title agreed by the Examiners must be approved by the Dissertation Supervisor and the Chair of Examiners. See further the Examination Regulations 2012, pp. 44, para. 16.6. The deadline for final approval for a change of title is Friday 31<sup>st</sup> May 2013.

### ***3. Method of Assessment***

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

### ***4. Submission of Dissertation***

Candidates shall be required to submit **two typewritten copies** of the Dissertation. The Dissertation must be typed or printed on one side of A4 paper only, with a margin of 3 to 3.5 centimeters on the left-hand side of each page. The text should be double-spaced and

the footnotes and quotations should be single-spaced. Pages should be numbered and **EACH page should record your examination number and the dissertation title in a header or footer box**. Candidates must **not** write their name or College anywhere on the Dissertation or envelope. The Dissertation should be bound or stapled, not held together by a paper clip. All written work must be submitted in English. For definitive guidance on the correct format for a dissertation please refer to **Appendix E**, and see also Section 7.7 of the Graduate Student Handbook 2012-2013 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/current/assessedessays.php>. 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 2012, pages 45-46, Part 16.8.(6)).

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

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

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

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

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

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

See further Examination Regulations 2012, pp. 45-46, para. 16.8. Candidates should consult their College Advisor if any of these provisions apply to them. See also Section B.5. above (third paragraph).

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

## ***5. Length***

Candidates should take seriously the word limits imposed (both upper and lower). If a candidate exceeds the word limit, the examiners may decide not to proceed with the examination of the work. If they do proceed, they may reduce the mark by up to one class (or its equivalent). See further Examination Regulations 2012, pp. 44 para. 16.6. Those who write less than the lower limit may likewise be penalized.

## ***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 2012, 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/edc/goodpractice/>; you are strongly advised to consult this website. Academic supervisors can provide practical guidance on providing references and bibliographies for your work. The University reserves the right to use software applications to screen any individual's submitted work for matches either to published sources or to other submitted work. In this connection, you are required to complete and submit with the Dissertation a **Declaration of Authorship**, including acknowledgement of the University's right to check for plagiarism or collusion. A blank

Declaration of Authorship for your use is on the MSc website:  
<http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/current/assessedessays.php>.

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 2012, pages 45-46, Part 16.8.(6)).

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

## ***7. Results***

The Examiners hope to be able to publish the dissertation results by Friday 19<sup>th</sup> July 2013 (i.e. the date upon which the Final Results are provisionally due to be published).

### **D. Overall Assessment and Publication of Results**

The degree of MSc shall be awarded to any candidate who achieves a mark of at least 50 per cent for (a) the five options and the ‘Research Design and Data Collection’ course, (b) the core course paper, and (c) the dissertation, as well as satisfactorily completes the continuous assessment element of ‘Research Design and Data Collection’, and, where relevant, those of ‘Social Explanation and Data Analysis’, and/or ‘Statistical Methods for Social Scientists’ and/or ‘Qualitative Methods’. The examiners award a distinction to any candidate who achieves marks of at least 70 per cent on at least six of the papers, as well as satisfactorily completes the continuous assessment element of ‘Research Design and Data Collection’, and, where relevant, those of ‘Social Explanation and Data Analysis’, and/or ‘Statistical Methods for Social Scientists’ and/or ‘Qualitative Methods’. In this calculation, both the core course and the dissertation shall count as two papers and each assessed essay shall count as one.

The Examiners hope to publish the final results by Friday 19<sup>th</sup> July 2013. Once the results have been released online, candidates will be sent an automatic e-mail to say their results are available to view. Candidates can then access their results via their Student Self Service. The Academic and Assessment Results page within Student Self Service details all assessment results (examination papers and/or submissions) and the final classification (if applicable) on this page. For further information candidates are referred to <http://www.ox.ac.uk/students/studentselfservice/?path=studentselfservice>. Informal individual transcripts (giving the breakdown of marks) will be mailed direct to candidates at their colleges once the final marks are published.

### **F. Proctors’ and Assessor’s Memorandum**

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

### **Board of Examiners**

S. Maruna (External Examiner)

R. Condry (Chair)

M. Bosworth

J Roberts

**Date 7 November 2012**

# Appendix A

## MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice 2012-2013

### 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 2012, Part 19, pages 51-52) **and the Proctors' Administrative Regulations for Candidates in Examinations** (see Examination Regulations 2012, 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. Water in spill-proof bottles (not screw top bottles) is the only refreshments allowed into the examination room.
9. Do not bring mobile telephones or any other electronic devices into the examination room.
10. Do not bring any papers, dictionaries or personal belongings, such as coats and bags, into the examination room. All articles or equipment to be used in an examination must be carried into the examination room in a transparent bag. Non-transparent bags must be offered for inspection and, unless special permission is given by an invigilator, must be deposited at the place designated for the deposit of bags and other personal belongings.
11. If you require more paper, raise your hand (preferably with a piece of paper in it) and it will be brought to you.

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

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

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

## Appendix B

### MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice 2012-2013

#### MARKING CONVENTIONS

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

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

(a) The degree of MSc shall be awarded to any candidate who achieves a mark of at least 50 per cent for (a) the five options and the 'Research Design and Data Collection' course, (b) the core course paper, and (c) the dissertation, as well as satisfactorily completes the continuous assessment element of 'Research Design and Data Collection', and, where relevant, those of 'Social Explanation and Data Analysis', and/or 'Statistical Methods for Social Scientists' and/or 'Qualitative Methods'.

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

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

(d). Students are expected to draw on the course readings in their options papers. While they may be rewarded for doing this and going beyond them to draw in additional work, examiners may reduce the mark of those who fail to cite course readings.

e). If a candidate exceeds the word limit, the examiners may decide not to proceed with the examination of the work. If they do proceed, they may reduce the mark by up to one class (or its equivalent). See further Examination Regulations 2012, pp. 44, para. 16.6. Those who write less than the lower limit may likewise be penalized.

# Appendix C

## MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice 2012-2013

### Assessment Standards

#### **70-100: Distinction level**

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

80-100: Superb work showing fine command of intellectual debates and making a creative contribution to them.

75-79: Excellent work, intellectually stimulating argument.

70-74: Fine work showing powerful analysis, a distinctive argument, and full awareness of the secondary literature and critical engagement with it.

#### **50-69: Pass**

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

**65-69:** Strong pass: Strong and well-developed independent critical analysis that moves beyond issues discussed in seminars. Clear and logical arguments and an awareness of nuances and complexities in debates. Strong evidence of independent research drawing on a wide range of literature. Some indication of distinction potential; no significant errors of fact or interpretation.

**55-64:** Good pass: Sound analytical standard with most points developed rather than stated. Some evidence of independent critical analysis and evaluation and synthesis of material. Addresses the question and provides a reasonably focused answer. Some awareness of nuances and complexities in debates.

**50-54:** Pass: Basic analytical skills apparent from identification of intellectual problems with some structured discussion of them. Partially addresses the question but lacks focus. Broadly satisfactory grasp of key issues. Arguments appropriate, but underdeveloped.

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

**0-49: Fail**

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

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

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

**‘Social Explanation and Data Analysis’, ‘Statistical Methods for Social Scientists’ and ‘Qualitative Methods’**

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

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

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

## Appendix D

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

#### What is plagiarism?

Plagiarism is the copying or paraphrasing of other people's work or ideas into your own work without full acknowledgement. All published and unpublished material, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, is covered under this definition. Collusion is another form of plagiarism involving the unauthorised collaboration of students (or others) in a piece of work. Cases of suspected plagiarism in assessed work are investigated under the disciplinary regulations (<http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/proctors/info/pam/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. This includes translation services and services that improve and edit your written English. It is vital to your intellectual training and development that you should undertake the research process unaided.
- **Autoplagerism.** 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://www.law.ox.ac.uk/publications/oscola.php>), or another useful standard for citation. You should consult your supervisor if you wish to depart from OSCOLA.

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

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

18 The word limits for theses:

	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>maximum</b>
<b>DPhil</b>	75,000	100,000
<b>MLitt</b>	40,000	50,000
<b>MPhil and MSt</b>	25,000	30,000
<b>QT Part B (for DPhil)</b>	8,000	10,000
<b>QT Part B (for MLitt)</b>	5,000	6,000
<b>MSc dissertation</b>	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. 2012-2013 Academic Year

		FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL
Grade	Pass	10	9	19
	Distinction	2	3	5
	Fail	0	0	0
	Extension	1	0	1
	Referred to Proctors	1	0	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>26</b>

Table 2. Degree Results by Gender. 2001-2012 Academic Years

	FEMALE	MALE
<i>2011-2012 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	5	9
Pass	11	0
Fail	2	0
Deferred	0	9
<i>2010 -11 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	2	0
Pass	8	7
Fail	0	0
Deferred	1	0
<i>2009-10 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	2
Pass	12	2
Fail	0	0
Deferred	0	0
<i>2008-9 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	2
Pass	5	9
Fail	0	0
Deferred	2	0
<i>2007-8 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	2
Pass	10	5
Fail	0	0
<i>2006-7 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	3
Pass	7	5
Fail	0	1

<i>2005-6 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	3	3
Pass	6	4
Fail	2	0
<i>2004-2005 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	2	2
Pass	6	4
Fail	0	0
<i>2003-2004 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	2
Pass	4	4
Fail	0	0
<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

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number of candidates</b>	<b>Lowest mark</b>	<b>Highest mark</b>	<b>Average mark</b>
Victims and Restorative Justice	15	54	74	67
Death Penalty	5	52	76	67
Public and Private Policing	9	62	74	67
	<i>Including RM students: 10</i>		67	
Prisons	14	52	75	67
Research Design and Data Collection	25	60	75	66
	<i>Including RM students: 26</i>		74	
Social Explanation and Data Analysis	7	64	69	67
	<i>Including RM students: 8</i>		68	
Qualitative Methods	7	60	70	67
	<i>Including RM students: 8</i>		72	
Sentencing	10	58	74	69
Media & Crime	12	50	72	62
Crime and the Family	12	61	75	68

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number of candidates</b>	<b>Lowest mark</b>	<b>Highest mark</b>	<b>Average mark</b>
Human Rights	7	66	76	70
Quantitative Analysis for Social Sciences	11	60	72	67
	<i>Including RM Students: 12</i>		68	
Violence and Civilisation	1			66
Comparative Criminal Justice	1	64		67
	<i>Including RM Students: 1</i>		70	
Crime, Political Ideology and Political Culture	9	60	70	65
	<i>Including RM Students: 10</i>		70	
Crime, Political Ideology and Political Culture				
Sociology of Punishment	4	64	70	66
Sentencing	10	58	74	69

Table 4. Core Course Exam results, showing the range of marks and average (including the one RM student excluding one referral to Proctors)

Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average
56	74	68

Table 5. Dissertation results, showing the range of marks and average for 24 candidates (excluded one extension to November, one referral to the Proctors)

Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average
58	76	67