1. Introduction

This document details the examination conventions for the MSc and MPhil degrees in Medical Anthropology (MA) in the School of Anthropology & Museum Ethnography (SAME) for the 2016-17 academic year. For MPhil students they apply both to those commencing their studies in October 2016 and to second-year students who commenced their studies in October 2015.

These conventions have been approved by the supervisory body, the Teaching Audit Committee of the Social Sciences Division.

Examination conventions are the formal record of the specific assessment standards for the courses to which they apply. They set out how examined work will be marked and how the resulting marks will be used to arrive at a final result and classification of an award.
2. Rubrics for individual papers

Full details of the constitution of individual papers, their examined elements, and relevant deadlines are outlined in the Course Handbook, available at http://www.anthro.ox.ac.uk/current-students/course-information/

2.1 MSc in Medical Anthropology

The MSc in Medical Anthropology is examined by the following means:

PART I (Comprising four papers)

**Paper 1: Concepts of Disease, Illness, Health and Medicine in Global Perspective**

Paper 1 is examined by an unseen written 3-hour examination, sat in June, in which each candidate answers three essay questions chosen from 12.

**Paper 2: Theory and Practice of Bio-medicine and of Other Medical Systems**

Paper 2 is examined by an unseen written 3-hour examination, sat in June, in which each candidate answers three essay questions chosen from 12.

**Paper 3: Critical Medical Anthropology**

Paper 3 is examined by an unseen written 3-hour examination, sat in June, in which each candidate answers three essay questions chosen from 12.

**Paper 4: Option paper**

Candidates must choose one option paper from those on offer in the School of Anthropology & Museum Ethnography (those available for the current academic year are listed at https://www.anthro.ox.ac.uk/current-students/course-information/).

The option papers available for the academic year are presented to all students at an ‘Options Fair’ held on the afternoon of Monday of 4th Week of Michaelmas Term, at which details of the courses and their assessment are presented by the course tutors. Preferred Option paper choices must be submitted to the Director of Graduate Studies by 12noon on Friday of 5th Week of Michaelmas Term.

The option paper must be chosen from any of Lists A, B and C (List A: The Social Anthropology of a Selected Region; List B: Topics in Material Anthropology; List C: Anthropology and Practical Issues).

The form of assessment depends upon the option paper chosen, as outlined at the ‘Options Fair’. This takes the form of either:

A 3-hour unseen written examination, sat in June, in which each candidate answers three essay questions chosen from 9.

or

Three typewritten copies of one essay of up to 5,000 words (including footnotes and endnotes, but not including the bibliography) submitted to the Examination Schools by 12 noon of Tuesday of 2nd week of Trinity Term.
PART II

Thesis
A research thesis of up to 10,000 words, submitted to the Examination Schools by 12 noon on the last Wednesday of August, on a subject selected in consultation with the supervisor.

The proposed title of the thesis together with a paragraph describing its scope and the supervisor's written endorsement, must be submitted to the Director of Graduate Studies by Tuesday of 2nd week of Trinity Term.

The word limit is deemed to apply to the text and footnotes or endnotes, but not to the bibliography, any appendices or glossaries, or to the front matter (abstract of up to 250 words, title page, contents page etc.).

2.2 MPhil in Medical Anthropology

Year 1 (MPhil Qualifying year, MPQ): As above for the MSc PART I, except that:

- the marks awarded in papers 1 to 4, and the overall single mark awarded that is derived from these, do not contribute to the final mark for the MPhil, but are used to assess continuation to the second year (see Section 4.3, below);
- MPhil students do not complete a thesis (Part II of the MSc) in the first year.

Year 2 (MPhil year):

1. Coursework: Methods of Fieldwork and Social Research

There are three examined components to the Methods of Fieldwork and Social Research course, which must be submitted as a dossier to the Examination Schools not later than 12 noon on Tuesday of 5th week of Trinity Term of the second year of the course. The three examined components consist of a choice of two of (a), (b) or (c), plus (d), as outlined below:

(a) One assessed paper on Ethnographic Fieldwork Methods; this typically consists of a research-task-generated document (e.g. hand-written notes of a period of participant-observation, any length, detailed guidance on the production of which is circulated to students on Monday of 4th Week of Hilary Term), and an essay of between 1500 and 2000 words (including footnotes and endnotes, but not including the bibliography). The essay should draw upon relevant literature and should cover the topic in general as well as reflect upon the specific task.

(b) One assessed paper on Statistical Fieldwork Methods; this is a take-home examination provided by the course convener not later than the Friday of 8th Week of Hilary Term. The examination has three parts:

(i) a series of short questions (theory) (worth a total of 30 points), and
(ii) a series of short questions (applications) (worth a total of 30 points), and
(iii) analysis of data (worth 40 points).

In order to pass this component, candidates must score at least 50 points in total, with a mark of not less than 15 for each of parts (i) and (ii) and not less than 20 for part (iii).

(c) One assessed paper on Language-Focused Methods of data-collection and analysis; this typically consists of a research-task-generated document (e.g. a semantic network assessment of a theme and its interpretation, detailed guidance on the production of which is circulated to students
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on Monday of 4th Week of Hilary Term), and an essay of between 1500 and 2000 words (including footnotes and endnotes, but not including the bibliography). The essay should draw upon relevant literature and should cover the topic in general as well as reflect upon the specific task. The research-task generated document and the essay should discuss themes of two different methods classes.

(d) An independently-composed research plan on a research project of the candidate’s choice of no more than 2500 words (including footnotes and endnotes, but not including the bibliography). The research proposal need not be on the theme of the MPhil thesis, but should reflect the candidate’s competence in conceiving and structuring an independent research project.

These must be accompanied by a statement that they are the candidate's own work except where otherwise indicated.

2. Thesis

A research thesis of up to 30,000 words, submitted to the Examination Schools by 12 noon on Tuesday of 5th Week of Trinity Term of the second year, on a subject selected in consultation with the supervisor.

A provisional title of the thesis, together with a paragraph describing its scope and the supervisor’s written endorsement, must be submitted to the Director of Graduate Studies by Tuesday of 5th week of Trinity Term of the first year. The final proposed title of the thesis, together with a paragraph describing its scope and the supervisor’s written endorsement, must be submitted to the Director of Graduate Studies by 12 noon on Monday of 2nd week of Michaelmas Term of the second year.

The word limit is deemed to apply to the text and footnotes or endnotes, but not to the bibliography, any appendices or glossaries, or to the front matter (abstract of up to 250 words, title page, contents page, etc.).
3. Marking conventions

3.1 University scale for standardised expression of agreed final marks

Agreed final marks for individual papers will be expressed using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>70-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>50-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>0-49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Qualitative criteria for different types of assessment

Qualitative criteria for the marking of the Timed Written Examinations, Submitted Essays, Ethnographic Fieldwork Methods paper, Statistical Fieldwork Methods paper, Research Proposal and Thesis are provided in the Appendix.

These marking conventions have been developed to offer guidance to students on the criteria examiners will be using in judging assessed work. They are also intended to guide examiners in identifying the appropriate mark for the work being assessed.

The Core Criteria, within each given form of assessment (dissertation, exam, essay etc.), are consistent across all of the degrees offered by the School, and are viewed as the fundamental traits that define work for each grade band.

The Ancillary Observations include additional traits that may be exhibited by work in a given grade band, in general and in relation to particular subjects (Social, Cognitive, Visual, Medical Anthropology), and are there to aid decision-making in the allocating of a mark within a grade band, and to provide further guidance to students regarding the types of traits that work of a given class may exhibit.

The positive Core Criteria are not replicated across grade bands, so are viewed as cumulative (i.e., for example, work that is in the 70-79 band will be expected to exhibit not only those positive traits listed for that grade band, but those of the lower bands too, except where mutually exclusive).

Candidates are reminded to also consult the relevant course handbooks and Exam Regulations (‘the grey book’) for further guidance on the presentation and submission of assessed coursework.

3.3 Verification and reconciliation of marks

All examined components of the degree are marked independently by two examiners or assessors from within the university (sometimes referred to as ‘double-blind marking’), with oversight of the entire process being provided by an External Examiner. This procedure follows university and divisional guidance. Each marker allots a mark to the piece of work in question (individual examination answers, essays and thesis) and then both markers meet to determine an agreed final mark for each element. Where the overall marks assigned by the two Examiners differ the examiners identify the reasons for the difference through discussion and agree an appropriate mark. If reconciliation is difficult, a third marker acts as arbiter in agreeing the appropriate mark, and answers that have been given particularly discrepant marks may be remarked if necessary. If the examiners cannot reach an agreement, the script is submitted to the External Examiner for adjudication. In cases of a great difference of marks, or where the marks straddle a grade boundary, the External Examiner
is asked to scrutinize any such marks, even if the examiners have agreed a mark following discussion. In addition, the External Examiner may query any mark assigned to a question, even if the internal examiners are unanimous in their judgement. Any differences of opinion are discussed fully at the examiners’ meeting.

The weighting for each assessed element is provided in Section 4.2, below.

For the unseen 3-hour examinations, the final mark for the paper is calculated (to two decimal places) as the mean of the marks awarded for each of the three essays, which are equally weighted.

3.5 Scaling

The School of Anthropology & Museum Ethnography does not use scaling mechanisms for examination marks.

3.5 Short-weight convention and departure from rubric

In 3-hour unseen examinations a mark of zero will be awarded for any questions that should have been answered by a candidate but have not been (e.g. if two questions are answered rather than three, a mark of zero is awarded for the question not attempted, and the final mark for that paper is determined as the mean of the marks for three questions, with the mark for the third question being zero). In the case that a candidate answers more questions than is required by the rubric all answers submitted will be marked and those achieving the best marks, up to and including the number required by the rubric, will be counted towards the mark for the paper with the others not being counted towards the mark for the paper.

In the case of examination answers or submitted pieces of coursework that are incomplete, or which fail to adhere to the stipulated rubric, these will be marked according to the criteria that are outlined in Section 3.2, above, which include specific criteria for marking work which is incomplete, rushed, or which departs from the stated rubric.

3.6 Penalties for late or non-submission

Non-submission of a required examined element of the course will result in failure of that element and thus of the whole Examination (programme of study), notwithstanding the opportunity to re-sit an examination that has been failed or to re-submit work that has been failed or has not been submitted as required (see Section 5, below).

In the absence of special dispensation for illness-related or other genuine reasons, late submission of examined elements of the course will incur penalties. Special dispensation for late submission must be sought, ideally in advance, from the Proctors, via the student’s college. Staff at the Examination Schools cannot give extensions, and examiners should not be approached. The scale of penalties agreed by the Board of Examiners in relation to late submission of assessed items is set out below. Details of the circumstances in which such penalties might apply can be found in the Examination Regulations (Regulations for the Conduct of University Examinations, Part 14.)

Where a candidate submits a thesis (or other piece of examined written coursework) after the deadline prescribed by the relevant regulation, the examiners will mark the work as if submitted on time. The Board of Examiners will then reduce the mark awarded according to the following tariff:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lateness</th>
<th>Mark penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submission after 12 noon on the day of submission</td>
<td>Two marks deducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One day late</td>
<td>Five marks deducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two days late</td>
<td>Ten marks deducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three days late</td>
<td>Fifteen marks deducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four days late</td>
<td>Twenty marks deducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five days late</td>
<td>Twenty-five marks deducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six days late</td>
<td>Thirty marks deducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One week late or more</td>
<td>Zero marks (fail) for this piece of work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Penalties for over-length work and departure from approved titles or subject-matter

Coursework must have the word count clearly indicated on the front cover. In all cases, word limits are deemed to apply to the text and footnotes or endnotes, but not to the bibliography, any appendices or glossaries, or to the front matter (abstract, title page, contents page, etc., if applicable).

Where a candidate submits a thesis or other piece of examined written coursework which exceeds the word limit prescribed by the relevant regulation, the examiners will mark the work as if submitted within the stipulated word limit. The Board of Examiners will then reduce the mark awarded according to the following tariff:

1 mark deduction for every 1% or part thereof by which the stated word limit is exceeded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word limit of submitted work</th>
<th>Penalty of one mark per:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>50 words or part thereof by which limit is exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000</td>
<td>100 words or part thereof by which limit is exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30000</td>
<td>300 words or part thereof by which limit is exceeded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where the examiners wish to query the word count, they may ask for an electronic version of the coursework to be submitted.

3.8 Penalties and procedures in cases of poor academic practice and plagiarism

The Examination Board shall deal wholly with cases of poor academic practice where the material under review is small and does not exceed 10% of the whole.

Assessors (including Examiners) will mark work on its academic merit, but will alert the Examination Board to cases of derivative or poor referencing, and the board will be responsible for deducting marks accordingly.

Determined by the extent of poor academic practice, the board shall deduct between 1% and 10% of the marks available for cases of poor referencing where material is widely available factual information or a technical description that could not be paraphrased easily; where passage(s) draw on
a variety of sources, either verbatim or derivative, in patchwork fashion (and examiners consider that this represents poor academic practice rather than an attempt to deceive); where some attempt has been made to provide references, however incomplete (e.g. footnotes but no quotation marks, Harvard-style references at the end of a paragraph, inclusion in bibliography); or where passage(s) are ‘grey literature’ i.e. a web source with no clear owner.

If a student has previously had marks deducted for poor academic practice or has been referred to the Proctors for suspected plagiarism the case must always be referred to the Proctors. Also, where the deduction of marks results in failure of the assessment and of the programme the case must be referred to the Proctors.

In addition, any more serious cases of poor academic practice than described above will also always be referred to the Proctors.
4. Progression rules and classification conventions

4.1 Qualitative descriptors of Distinction, Pass, Fail

Distinction: Demonstrates overall excellence, including sufficient depth and breadth of relevant knowledge to allow clarity of expression, demonstration of critical faculties and originality.

Pass: Demonstrates overall a good standard of knowledge and familiarity with material, and the ability to apply it effectively.

Fail: Fails overall to demonstrate a sufficient range and depth of knowledge and understanding, and/or fails to apply it appropriately.

Note that the aggregation and classification rules in some circumstances allow a stronger performance on some papers to compensate for a weaker performance on others.

4.2 Final outcome rules

To be eligible to be awarded the degree of MSc or MPhil, candidates must have passed all of the examined components of the course; see also Examination Regulations 2016-17 (the ‘Grey Book’): https://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/examregs/2016-17/mosbcinmedianth/studentview/ (MSc) and https://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/examregs/2016-17/mopinmedianth/studentview/ (MPhil). Regarding eligibility for re-examination, see Section 5, below.

Each assessed element outlined in Section 2, above, contributes the proportion stated below to the final mark for the course.

**MSc in Medical Anthropology**

**PART I**

*Paper 1: Concepts of Disease, Illness, Health and Medicine in Global Perspective*: One-sixth

*Paper 2: Theory and Practice of Bio-medicine and of Other Medical Systems*: One-sixth

*Paper 3: Critical Medical Anthropology*: One-sixth

*Paper 4: Option Paper*: One-sixth

**PART II**

*Thesis*: One-third

The final mark for the MSc is calculated as the mean of the marks awarded for all of the assessed components, as outlined in Section 2, above, weighted as indicated, and with the final mark rounded to the nearest whole number, with decimal points of .5 and above rounded up to the nearest whole mark.

The Board of Examiners may award a Distinction in the degree based on one of the following criteria:

EITHER an overall average mark of 70 or above OR an overall average mark of 68 and above, with two assessed components and the MSc thesis at 70 or above.

**MPhil in Medical Anthropology**

*Year 1*: (MPQ: MPhil Qualifying examinations)

*Paper 1: Concepts of Disease, Illness, Health and Medicine in Global Perspective*: One-quarter

*Paper 2: Theory and Practice of Bio-medicine and of Other Medical Systems*: One-quarter

*Paper 3: Critical Medical Anthropology*: One-quarter

*Paper 4: Option Paper*: One-quarter
All four papers are equally weighted (i.e. represent 25% of the year 1 (MPQ examination) marks). The final mark for the MPQ examinations is an average of the four individual marks, with the final mark rounded to the nearest whole number, with decimal points of .5 and above rounded up to the nearest whole mark. Marks for assessments in the MPQ year do not contribute to the final mark for the MPhil, but are used to determine continuation to the second year (see Section 4.3, below). To progress to year 2 of the MPhil candidates must have passed all four of the Qualifying examinations sat in year 1.

**Year 2: (MPhil examinations)**

*Coursework: 30%* (Research Project Plan: 10%; plus two of: (i) Ethnographic Fieldwork Methods: 10%; (ii) paper on Quantitative Fieldwork Methods: 10%; (iii) Language-focused methods of data collection and their interpretation)

*Thesis: 70%

The final mark for the MPhil course is calculated as the mean of the marks awarded for all of the assessed components *examined in the second year*, as outlined in Section 2, above, weighted as indicated, and with the final mark rounded to the nearest whole number, with decimal points of .5 and above rounded up to the nearest whole mark.

The Board of Examiners may award a Distinction in the degree for achievement of an overall average mark of 70 or above.

### 4.3 Progression rules from the MSc to the MPhil Medical Anthropology

After the written examinations in June, students in the first-year of Medical Anthropology have a choice between two possibilities, depending on their performance in the examined work: 1) complete the MSc degree, with submission of a thesis in August; or 2) complete the MPhil degree by continuing for a second year and beginning immediately to plan for the MPhil thesis.

Subject to the conditions outlined below, MSc students may transfer to the MPhil at any time up to immediately after the announcement of the final results in September; they should not formally take the MSc degree in these cases, and any transcripts for this degree that have been issued to them will become invalid and must be returned as a condition of transferring. Under these circumstances any thesis research undertaken for the MSc may, but need not, be used towards the thesis undertaken for the MPhil in year 2; they will be required to submit the *final* proposed title of the MPhil thesis together with a paragraph describing its scope and the supervisor's written endorsement, to the Director of Graduate Studies by Tuesday of 2nd week of Michaelmas Term of the second year, as detailed in section 2.2, above.

First-year MPhil students may transfer to the MSc at any time in that year up to immediately after the announcement of the results of the Part I examinations in June, so that they can at that point embark immediately on preparing an MSc thesis, as detailed below.

### MSc in Medical Anthropology

**Continuation to PRS status for DPhil study after the MSc:** MSc candidates may apply for admission as Probationer Research Students (PRS) during the admissions rounds that take place in their MSc year, subject to the usual process and admissions criteria (see [http://www.anthro.ox.ac.uk/prospective-students/admission/application-process/](http://www.anthro.ox.ac.uk/prospective-students/admission/application-process/)).
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Continuation to MPhil study: MSc candidates are eligible for continuation to the second year of MPhil study if:

a) they pass all components of the degree that are examined before the summer (as detailed in section 2.1: PART I, above), achieving an average mark of 60 or more, and subject to availability of appropriate supervision, in which case they will at that stage begin to plan for the MPhil thesis rather than preparing the MSc thesis; or

b) they submit an MSc thesis in August and achieve an average mark of 60 or more including the thesis, and subject to availability of appropriate supervision, in which case they will at that stage begin to plan for the MPhil thesis, which will usually (but need not) be on a topic related to their MSc dissertation.

In either case candidates must submit a provisional title of the MPhil thesis together with a paragraph describing its scope and the supervisor's written endorsement to the Director of Graduate Studies at the time of application to transfer to the MPhil programme.

MPhil in Medical Anthropology

Continuation to second year: MPhil candidates are eligible to continue to the second year if they pass all components of the MPQ examinations (as detailed in section 2.1, above), achieving an average mark of 60 or more.

Those who do not achieve this mark, or who for other reasons do not continue to the second year of the MPhil, will be allowed to instead prepare and submit a thesis according to the requirements for the MSc degree, and to be admitted, pending achievement of an overall Pass mark (50+) in September, to the MSc degree.

If their final mark for all components of the MSc (including performance in the MSc thesis), is 60 or greater, they will have the opportunity to receive the MSc or transfer back to the MPhil programme and to enter the second year of the course.

Continuation to DPhil study after second year: MPhil candidates may apply for admission for DPhil study during the admissions rounds that take place in the second year of their MPhil, subject to the usual process and admissions criteria (see http://www.anthro.ox.ac.uk/prospective-students/admission/application-process/).

If the research that they propose to undertake for their DPhil project is a direct continuation of that undertaken for the MPhil thesis in the second year then they may be admitted as full DPhil students rather than as Probationer Research Students (PRS).

4.4 Use of vivas

There are no automatic viva voce examinations for MSc or MPhil candidates but the examiners reserve the right to call candidates if required.

Viva voce examinations may be used by the examiners in cases where candidates fall on the borderline of Distinction/Pass or Pass/Fail classifications as a means of resolving any ambiguities in the examined work (in the case of MPhil candidates only the work submitted in the second year) that may lead to greater credit being given to a candidate than is possible on the basis of the examined work alone. Marks will not be reduced as a consequence of performance in a viva voce examination; they can only remain as they are or be raised.
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If held, *viva voce* examinations normally occur in the third week of June (MPhil) or the last week of September (MSc). Candidates will be notified as far ahead of these dates as possible if they are to be called.
5 Resits

Where an examined component has been failed at the first attempt, students are entitled to one further attempt. This applies to any or all components that have been failed at the first attempt.

In the case of examined submitted work (including the thesis) this further attempt takes the form of a re-submission, after revision, of the work in question, at the equivalent time in the year following that in which it was originally due to be submitted. In the case of sat exams, this further attempt takes the form of a new examination paper which, at the student’s request and subject to the agreement of the Examiner for the degree, may be sat either before the end of the same academic year, or in June of the following academic year.

Marks for any element that has been successfully completed at the first attempt will be carried forward, and therefore it is only possible for students to re-sit the failed element(s). Any subsequent award of the degree on successful completion of all the assessed components may be delayed by up to three terms, i.e. until the Examination Board next meets.

A student who achieves the required standard in the MSc by re-sitting paper(s) (including re-submitting the thesis if required) may then proceed to the MPhil or to PRS status, subject to the application processes and criteria outlined in section 4.3, above.

A student who passes the MPhil by re-sitting paper(s) (including re-submitting the thesis if required) and achieving the required standard may then proceed to DPhil student status in the School of Anthropology, subject to the application processes and criteria outlined in section 4.3, above.
6 Factors affecting performance

Where a candidate or candidates have made a submission, via their College, under Part 13 of the Regulations for Conduct of University Examinations, that unforeseen factors may have had an impact on their performance in an examination a subset of the board will meet to discuss the individual applications and band the seriousness of each application on a scale of 1-3 with 1 indicating minor impact, 2 indicating moderate impact and 3 indicating very serious impact.

When reaching this decision, examiners will take into consideration the severity and relevance of the circumstances and the strength of the evidence. Examiners will also note whether all or a subset of papers were affected, being aware that it is possible for circumstances to have different levels of impact on different papers. The banding information will be used at the final board of examiners meeting to adjudicate on the merits of candidates and to adjust marks accordingly.

Further information on the procedure is provided in the Policy and Guidance for examiners, Annex B and information for students is provided at www.ox.ac.uk/students/academic/exams/guidance.
7 Details of examiners and rules on communicating with examiners

The Examiner for the Medical Anthropology degrees is Prof. Elisabeth Hsu.

The External Examiner for the Medical Anthropology degrees is Dr Kate Hampshire, University of Durham.

Questions pertaining to examination procedure should be addressed to the Examiner or Chairman of Examiners. In the academic year 2016-17, the Chairman of Examiners will be Professor Stanley Ulijaszek.

Candidates are not under any circumstances permitted to seek to make contact with individual internal or external examiners during or after the examination process regarding specifics of the examination of their own or others’ work.

Candidates who are unhappy with an aspect of their assessment may make a complaint or appeal to the Proctors via their college.
### APPENDIX

#### 1: Marking Criteria for Timed Written Examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
<th>Core Criteria</th>
<th>Ancillary Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Distinction | 80-100 | An exemplary answer  
Features comprehensive, excellent, well-documented knowledge of relevant material, going well beyond core literature  
The answer is scholarly, with outstanding synthesis and sustained high level of critical analysis of evidence and major issues  
Features originality of approach and/or discussion  
The answer is meticulously organised and presented | The answer may, in principle, be of publishable standard  
The answer may feature a wealth of relevant information showing excellent knowledge and understanding  
The answer may be highly sophisticated or incisive  
It may show new and worthwhile ways of considering the material |
| | 70-79 | An excellent answer  
Features close engagement with the question  
Demonstrates excellent understanding of an extensive range of relevant material, going beyond core literature  
Demonstrates thorough knowledge of current major issues in the field  
Features excellent synthesis, analysis and critique of relevant evidence and theories  
Arguments are well-structured, clearly and persuasively made  
The answer may feature a wealth of relevant information showing excellent knowledge and understanding  
It may show new and worthwhile ways of considering the material | |
| Pass | 60-69 High Pass | A very good to consistently competent answer.  
Features good, broad-based engagement with and understanding of the core relevant material  
The answer is clearly organised, argued and well-illustrated  
The answer is regularly, but not consistently, sophisticated in analysis, impressive in display of relevant knowledge and originality  
It is possible there are some minor errors of fact or omissions of relevant material, particularly at the lower end | An answer in this band always features competent and accurate reproduction of received ideas  
Upper end: The answer may have Distinction qualities in places, but less consistently so, and may be less comprehensive or sophisticated in critique  
Lower end: Ideas, critical comment or methodology may be under-developed or over-simplified; arguments may be less sophisticated and coherent  
The work may otherwise be of Pass quality but show some Distinction-level inspiration |
| | 50-59 Pass | An answer which is competent in places or in some respects but weak in others.  
**Positive**  
The answer exhibits some knowledge and understanding of the chosen topic and the relevant evidence and ideas  
The answer is competent and broadly relevant  
**Negative**  
Some important information and references are lacking  
The answer displays weaknesses of understanding and superficiality  
Some arguments are lacking in focus. | The answer may have High Pass quality in places but be too short, rushed, unfinished, badly organised or may not adequately address the question  
To be awarded marks in this band the answer must feature the positive traits identified (left); placement within this mark band depends upon the extent to which the positive traits are undermined by the negative traits. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Work not submitted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-39</td>
<td>There is some attempt at the exercise, but it is seriously lacking in planning, content and presentation</td>
<td>The answer may show a modicum of relevant elementary knowledge but be largely irrelevant, superficial and incoherent with significant misunderstanding and errors. Marks at the bottom end of this scale include virtually nothing, or nothing of relevance in the answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>The candidate may have missed the point of the question. The candidate may have failed to adhere to the rubric (e.g. by answering well but on material explicitly excluded). An otherwise competent candidate who has fallen seriously short of time may fall into upper end of this category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>The answer exhibits only rudimentary knowledge and analysis of relevant material. There is evidence of some basic understanding. Material is inadequately discussed, misrepresented or misunderstood. There are significant factual errors and/or incoherent arguments. The answer is poorly organised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>There is little evidence of awareness of essential literature, evidence or arguments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development or Coherence</td>
<td>The answer may feature some significant factual errors. There may be considerable proportion that is irrelevant or doesn't address the question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2: Marking Criteria for Submitted Essays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
<th>Core Criteria</th>
<th>Ancillary Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>An exemplary piece of work An excellent piece of work Features comprehensive, excellent, well-documented knowledge of relevant material, going well beyond core literature The work is scholarly, with outstanding synthesis and sustained high level of critical analysis of evidence and major issues Features originality of approach and/or discussion The work is meticulously organised and presented</td>
<td>The work may feature a wealth of relevant information showing excellent knowledge and understanding The work may be highly sophisticated or incisive It may show new and worthwhile ways of considering the material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>A very good to consistently competent piece of work. Features good, broad-based engagement with and understanding of the core relevant material The work is clearly organised, argued and well-illustrated The work is regularly, but not consistently, sophisticated in analysis, impressive in display of relevant knowledge and originality It is possible there are some minor errors of fact or omissions of relevant material, particularly at the lower end</td>
<td>Work marked in this band always features competent and accurate reproduction of received ideas Upper end: The work may have Distinction qualities in places, but less consistently so, and may be less comprehensive or sophisticated in critique The work makes good use of medical anthropological cases and the essay is well-illustrated with appropriate material that adds to the arguments in effective ways Lower end: Ideas, critical comment or methodology may be under-developed or over-simplified; arguments may be less sophisticated and coherent Medical anthropological studies are present but fewer in number than ideal or not always appropriate; some examples may be poor or unhelpful The work may otherwise be of Pass quality but show some Distinction-level inspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>A piece of work which is competent in places or in some respects but weak in others. Positive The work exhibits some knowledge and understanding of the chosen topic and the relevant evidence and ideas The work is competent and broadly relevant Negative The work may have High Pass quality in places but be too short, rushed, unfinished, badly organised or may not adequately address the question May include insufficient medical anthropological examples to support the argument To be awarded marks in this band the work must feature the positive traits identified (left); placement within this mark band depends upon the extent to which the positive traits are undermined by the negative traits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Range</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td><strong>Positive</strong>&lt;br&gt;The work exhibits only rudimentary knowledge and analysis of relevant material&lt;br&gt;There is evidence of some basic understanding&lt;br&gt;<strong>Negative</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is little evidence of awareness of essential literature, evidence or arguments&lt;br&gt;Material is inadequately discussed, misrepresented or misunderstood.&lt;br&gt;There are significant factual errors and/or incoherent arguments&lt;br&gt;The work is poorly organised</td>
<td>The candidate may have interpreted the question in an unconvincing way with little or no reference to key terms in the question&lt;br&gt;The work may be unduly brief&lt;br&gt;The work may include few or no medical anthropological case studies&lt;br&gt;The candidate may have failed to adhere to the rubric (e.g. by writing well but on material explicitly excluded)&lt;br&gt;An otherwise competent candidate who has fallen seriously short of time may fall into upper end of this category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-39</td>
<td>There is some attempt at the exercise, but it is seriously lacking in planning, content and presentation&lt;br&gt;The work may show a modicum of relevant elementary knowledge but be largely irrelevant, superficial and incoherent with significant misunderstanding and errors</td>
<td>Marks at the top end of this scale may include superficial knowledge of some relevant points&lt;br&gt;Marks at the bottom end of this scale include virtually nothing, or nothing of relevance in the answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Work not submitted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Marking Criteria for the paper on Ethnographic Fieldwork Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
<th>Core Criteria</th>
<th>Ancillary Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>An exemplary piece of work</td>
<td>The work may feature a wealth of relevant information showing excellent knowledge and understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Features comprehensive, excellent, well-documented knowledge of relevant material, going well beyond core literature</td>
<td>The work may be highly sophisticated or incisive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The work is scholarly, with outstanding synthesis and sustained high level of critical analysis of evidence and major issues</td>
<td>It may show new and worthwhile ways of considering the material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Features originality of approach and/or discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The work is meticulously organised and presented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>An excellent piece of work</td>
<td>The work may feature a wealth of relevant information showing excellent knowledge and understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Pass</td>
<td></td>
<td>Features close engagement with the question</td>
<td>The work may be highly sophisticated or incisive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates excellent understanding of an extensive range of relevant material, going beyond core literature</td>
<td>The work may show new and worthwhile ways of considering the material, especially combining social and biological-based studies in creative new ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates thorough knowledge of current major issues in the field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Features excellent synthesis, analysis and critique of relevant evidence and theories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arguments are well-structured, clearly and persuasively made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Features originality of approach and/or discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>A very good to consistently competent piece of work.</td>
<td>Work marked in this band always features competent and accurate reproduction of received ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Pass</td>
<td>Features good, broad-based engagement with and understanding of the core relevant material</td>
<td>Upper end: The work may have Distinction qualities in places, but less consistently so, and may be less comprehensive or sophisticated in critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The work is clearly organised, argued and well-illustrated</td>
<td>The work makes good use of medical anthropological cases and the essay is well-illustrated with appropriate material that adds to the arguments in effective ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The work is regularly, but not consistently, sophisticated in analysis, impressive in display of relevant knowledge and originality</td>
<td>Lower end: Ideas, critical comment or methodology may be under-developed or over-simplified; arguments may be less sophisticated and coherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is possible there are some minor errors of fact or omissions of relevant material, particularly at the lower end</td>
<td>Medical anthropological studies are present but fewer in number than ideal or not always appropriate; some examples may be poor or unhelpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The work may have High Pass quality in places but be too short, rushed, unfinished, badly organised or may not adequately address the question</td>
<td>The work may otherwise be of Pass quality but show some Distinction-level inspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>A piece of work which is competent in places or in some respects but weak in others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The work exhibits some knowledge and understanding of the chosen topic and the relevant evidence and ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The work is competent and broadly relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The work may have High Pass quality in places but be too short, rushed, unfinished, badly organised or may not adequately address the question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May include insufficient medical anthropological examples to support the argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be awarded marks in this band the work must feature the positive traits identified (left); placement within this mark band depends upon the extent to which the positive traits are undermined by the negative traits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>1-39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>The candidate may have interpreted the question in an unconvincing way with little or no reference to key terms in the question.</td>
<td>There is some attempt at the exercise, but it is seriously lacking in planning, content and presentation.</td>
<td>Work not submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>The work may be unduly brief.</td>
<td>The work may show a modicum of relevant elementary knowledge but be largely irrelevant, superficial and incoherent with significant misunderstanding and errors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is little evidence of awareness of essential literature, evidence or arguments.</td>
<td>Marks at the top end of this scale may include superficial knowledge of some relevant points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Material is inadequately discussed, misrepresented or misunderstood.</td>
<td>Marks at the bottom end of this scale include virtually nothing, or nothing of relevance in the answer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are significant factual errors and/or incoherent arguments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The work is poorly organised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some important information and references are lacking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The work displays weaknesses of understanding and superficiality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some arguments are lacking in focus, development or coherence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The work may feature some significant factual errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There may be considerable proportion that is irrelevant or doesn't address the question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Marking Criteria for the paper on Statistical Fieldwork Methods

The Statistical Methods examination is marked out of 100 points, with the following breakdown:

(i) Short questions (theory): 30 points;
(ii) Short questions (applications): 30 points;
(iii) Analysis of data: 40 points.

In order to pass the examination, candidates must score at least 50 points in total, with a mark of not less than 15 for each of parts (i) and (ii) and not less than 20 for part (iii).

The breakdown of points awarded for each component is given next to each question on the examination paper.

These read, for example:

**Question 3.1 [30 pts total]**

Produce a report in a style suitable for the results section of a journal article, properly formatted (e.g. figures and tables in the text, with captions; plots labelled).

- Describe the sample in relation to weight, height, gender, activity level, by type of school. Use descriptive statistics, graphs, and tables as appropriate. [5 pts]

- Provide inferential statistics regarding differences in weight as a function of type of school. Include the following information:
  - the test used and its justification; [1 pt]
  - the null hypothesis; [2 pts]
  - values for the statistical test, the 95% confidence interval, and the p-value; [3 pts]
  - conclusions regarding the null hypothesis; [2 pts]
  - a plot summarizing the results. [2 pts]

- Provide diagnostic plots to assess whether a linear model is appropriate to predict weight (response variable) as a function of height and gender (explanatory variables). [5 pts]

- Provide the R code used to answer the question, legible and properly annotated. [10 pts]

In marking these questions examiners will award marks on the basis of appropriateness of calculations, accuracy and evidence of understanding. Answers that are partially complete and/or partially correct may be awarded a partial score.
## 5: Marking Criteria for Research Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
<th>Core Criteria</th>
<th>Ancillary Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|            | 80-100     | An exemplary piece of work  
Features comprehensive, excellent, well-documented knowledge of relevant material, going well beyond core methodological literature  
The work is scholarly, with outstanding synthesis and sustained high level of critical analysis of evidence and major issues  
Features originality of approach  
The work is meticulously organised and presented | The work may feature a wealth of relevant information showing excellent knowledge and understanding  
The work may be highly sophisticated or incisive  
It may show new and worthwhile ways of considering research methodology  
The work may feature especially creative approaches towards the anthropology of medicine, and/or to biologically-based research |
| Distinction| 70-79      | An excellent piece of work  
Features close engagement with the topic  
Demonstrates excellent understanding of an extensive range of relevant methodological literature  
Demonstrates thorough knowledge of current major issues in the field  
Features excellent synthesis, analysis and critique of relevant evidence and theories  
Justification for research is well-structured, clearly and persuasively made  
The work may feature a wealth of relevant information showing excellent knowledge and understanding  
The work may be highly sophisticated or incisive  
The work may show new and worthwhile ways of considering research methodology |
| Pass       | 60-69      | A very good to consistently competent piece of work.  
Features good, broad-based engagement with and understanding of the core methodological approaches  
The work is clearly organised, argued and well-illustrated  
The work is regularly, but not consistently, sophisticated in proposed use of methods, impressive in display of relevant knowledge and originality  
It is possible there are some minor errors of fact or omissions of relevant material, particularly at the lower end | Work marked in this band always features competent and accurate reproduction of received ideas  
Upper end: The work may have Distinction qualities in places, but less consistently so, and may be less comprehensive or sophisticated in critique  
The work makes good use of comparative examples and situates the planned research effectively within the field  
Lower end: Ideas, critical comment or proposed research methodology may be under-developed or over-simplified; arguments may be less sophisticated and coherent  
The proposed research is relevant to key debates in medical anthropology but the connections are not always well developed  
The work may otherwise be of Pass quality but show some Distinction-level inspiration |
| High Pass  | 50-59      | A piece of work which is competent in places or in some respects but weak in others.  
Positive  
The work exhibits some knowledge and understanding of the chosen topic and the relevant methods with which to research the topic  
The work is competent and broadly relevant  
Negative  
Some relevant methods are undiscussed  
The work displays weaknesses of understanding | The work may have High Pass quality in places but be too short, rushed, unfinished, badly organised or may not adequately address the question  
May include insufficient medical anthropological examples to justify the proposed research.  
To be awarded marks in this band the work must feature the positive traits identified (left); placement within this mark band depends upon the extent to which the positive traits are undermined by the negative traits. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>The work exhibits only rudimentary knowledge and analysis of relevant methodological literature</td>
<td>The candidate has been unable to formulate a convincing research topic and identify the methods needed to investigate it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is evidence of some basic understanding</td>
<td>The work may be unduly brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The research proposed has little if any relevance to medical anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The candidate may have failed to adhere to the rubric (e.g. by writing well but not formulating a programme of research to address the topic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An otherwise competent candidate who has fallen seriously short of time may fall into upper end of this category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-39</td>
<td>There is some attempt at the exercise, but it is seriously lacking in planning, content and presentation</td>
<td>Marks at the top end of this scale may include superficial knowledge of some relevant points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The work may show a modicum of relevant elementary knowledge but be largely irrelevant, superficial and incoherent with significant misunderstanding and errors</td>
<td>Marks at the bottom end of this scale include virtually nothing, or nothing of relevance in the answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Work not submitted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination Conventions: MSc and MPhil in Medical Anthropology (MA)

Some arguments are lacking in focus, development or coherence
The work may feature some significant factual errors
There may be considerable proportion that is irrelevant or doesn't address the research topic identified

The work may be unduly brief
The research proposed has little if any relevance to medical anthropology
The candidate may have failed to adhere to the rubric (e.g. by writing well but not formulating a programme of research to address the topic)
An otherwise competent candidate who has fallen seriously short of time may fall into upper end of this category

Marks at the top end of this scale may include superficial knowledge of some relevant points
Marks at the bottom end of this scale include virtually nothing, or nothing of relevance in the answer

Work not submitted.
6: Marking criteria for MSc and MPhil Theses

The same marking criteria are used for MSc (10,000-word) and MPhil (30,000-word) theses, but are applied taking into account the differences in length and compass expected of the projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
<th>Core Criteria</th>
<th>Ancillary Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>Features comprehensive, excellent, well-documented knowledge of relevant material, going well beyond core literature&lt;br&gt;The work is scholarly, with outstanding synthesis and sustained high level of critical analysis of evidence and major issues&lt;br&gt;Features originality of approach and/or discussion&lt;br&gt;The work is meticulously organised and presented to the highest scholarly standards</td>
<td>The work may feature a wealth of relevant information showing excellent knowledge and understanding&lt;br&gt;The work may be highly sophisticated or incisive&lt;br&gt;It may show new and worthwhile ways of considering the material&lt;br&gt;The work may feature especially creative use of medical anthropological data and analyses and/or reference to cultural medical practices in the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>Presents and addresses a clearly stated research objective&lt;br&gt;Demonstrates excellent understanding of an extensive range of relevant material, going beyond core literature&lt;br&gt;Demonstrates thorough knowledge of current major issues in the field&lt;br&gt;Features excellent synthesis, analysis and critique of relevant evidence and theories&lt;br&gt;Thesis argument is well-structured, clearly and persuasively made&lt;br&gt;Features originality of approach and/or discussion</td>
<td>The work may feature a wealth of relevant information showing excellent knowledge and understanding&lt;br&gt;The work may be highly sophisticated or incisive&lt;br&gt;The work may show new and worthwhile ways of considering the material, especially combining social and biological-based studies in creative new ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>60-69&lt;br&gt;High Pass</td>
<td>A very good to consistently competent piece of work.&lt;br&gt;Features good, broad-based engagement with and understanding of the core relevant material&lt;br&gt;The work is clearly organised, argued and well-illustrated&lt;br&gt;The work is regularly, but not consistently, sophisticated in analysis, impressive in display of relevant knowledge and originality&lt;br&gt;It is possible there are some minor errors of fact or omissions of relevant material, particularly at the lower end</td>
<td>Work marked in this band always features competent and accurate reproduction of received ideas&lt;br&gt;Upper end: The work may have Distinction qualities in places, but less consistently so, and may be less comprehensive or sophisticated in critique&lt;br&gt;The work makes good use of medical anthropological cases and the thesis is well-illustrated with appropriate material that adds to the arguments in effective ways&lt;br&gt;Lower end: Ideas, critical comment or methodology may be under-developed or over-simplified; arguments may be less sophisticated and coherent&lt;br&gt;Medical anthropological studies are present but fewer in number than ideal or not always appropriate; some examples may be poor or unhelpful&lt;br&gt;The research objective is unclear or unoriginal&lt;br&gt;The work may otherwise be of Pass quality but show some Distinction-level inspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>50-59&lt;br&gt;Pass</td>
<td>A piece of work which is competent in places or in some respects but weak in others.&lt;br&gt;Positive&lt;br&gt;The work exhibits some knowledge and understanding of the chosen topic and the relevant evidence and ideas</td>
<td>The work may have High Pass quality in places but be too short, rushed, unfinished, badly organised or may not adequately address the question&lt;br&gt;May include insufficient medical anthropological examples to support the argument&lt;br&gt;To be awarded marks in this band the work must...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Examination Conventions: MSc and MPhil in Medical Anthropology (MA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>The work exhibits only rudimentary knowledge and analysis of relevant material</td>
<td>There is evidence of some basic understanding</td>
<td>There is no clear research objective or question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is evidence of some basic understanding</td>
<td>There is little evidence of awareness of essential literature, evidence or arguments</td>
<td>The work may be unduly brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Material is inadequately discussed, misrepresented or misunderstood.</td>
<td>The work may include few or no medical anthropological examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are significant factual errors and/or incoherent arguments</td>
<td>There are significant factual errors and/or incoherent arguments</td>
<td>The candidate may have failed to adhere to the rubric (e.g. by writing well but not producing a clearly structured and coherent thesis narrative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The work is poorly organised and presented</td>
<td>The work is poorly organised and presented</td>
<td>An otherwise competent candidate who has fallen seriously short of time may fall into upper end of this category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-39</td>
<td>There is some attempt at the exercise, but it is seriously lacking in planning, content and presentation</td>
<td>The work may show a modicum of relevant elementary knowledge but be largely irrelevant, superficial and incoherent with significant misunderstanding and errors</td>
<td>Marks at the top end of this scale may include superficial knowledge of some relevant points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Work not submitted.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marks at the bottom end of this scale include virtually nothing, or nothing of relevance to the discipline(s) of medical anthropology in the thesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>