



**INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY**

**ARCL0189: SOURCES AND SOCIAL RESEARCH METHODS FOR  
HERITAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGY**

**2018-2019**

**Option, 0.5 units**

**15 CREDITS**

**Turnitin Class ID: 3885727**

**Password: loA1819**

**Deadline for coursework: 14 March and 10 May 2019**

**Marked assignments returned by: 11 April and 7 June 2019**

**Co-ordinator:** Rachel King (Room 202) and Veysel Apaydin (Room 322A)

**E:** [tcrnrki@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:tcrnrki@ucl.ac.uk), [tcrn107@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:tcrn107@ucl.ac.uk)

**T:** 020 7679 7507

**Internal ext.:** 27507

**R202 Office hours:** Fridays 10.00-11.00

# 1. Overview

## 1.1. Short description

This module provides an overview of the key sources, methodologies, and practical frameworks used in qualitative research in the fields of heritage studies and archaeology. Topics include ethnography in theory and practice, research ethics, visual and object-based methodologies, archival science, participant observation, audience research, internet ethnography and digital methodologies, spatial methodologies, and research design. Throughout, the emphasis is on linking theory with practice across a variety of global and situational contexts, and equipping students to think critically about their own research. Students will learn to engage with the methods underpinning current research, as well as to develop and defend their own methodological decisions. The course will provide opportunities to develop professional skills like conducting interviews and observations, analysing qualitative data, and writing research proposals.

## 1.2. Week-by-week summary

Session	Date	Topic	Room
1	10 Jan 2019	Introduction: Research and its subjects	612
2	17 Jan 2019	Ethnography and its discontents	612
3	24 Jan 2019	Observation, participation, and other ways of hanging out	612
4	31 Jan 2019	Data analysis and interpretation	612
5	7 Feb 2019	The Only Way is Ethics	612
<b>Reading week 11-15 February 2019</b>			
6	21 Feb 2019	Visual and popular cultures	612
7	28 Feb 2019	Landscapes: Data, dwellings, or dangerous ground	612
8	7 Mar 2019	Archives and historical texts	612
9	14 Mar 2019	The Internet and digital methods	612
10	21 Mar 2019	Fieldwork activity	612

## 1.3. Basic texts

Borneman, J. and Hammoudi, A. (eds.) 2009. *Being There: The Fieldwork Encounter and the Making of Truth*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cohen, A. 1989. *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London: Routledge.

Harrison, R. 2013. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge. Chapters 2 and 6.

Meskill, L. and Pels, P. (eds.) 2005. *Embedding Ethics*. London: Berg.

Stig Sørensen, M.L. and Carman, J. (eds.) 2008. *Heritage Studies: Methods and Approaches*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

#### **1.4. Methods of assessment**

This course is assessed by means of two pieces of coursework, each of 1,900-2,100 words, which each contribute 50% to the final grade for the course.

#### **1.5. Teaching methods**

This course is taught through lectures and seminars, organised into themed blocs and led by co-ordinators with guest lecturers as appropriate. For many seminars, students are expected to complete tasks (specified in the syllabus) in advance of the session. These tasks will form the basis of the seminar activities and discussions. In addition, practical sessions and field trips may be arranged to give students greater familiarity with the sources and methods covered in the course.

#### **1.6. Workload**

There will be 10 hours of lectures and 10 hours of seminars and/or practical sessions for this course. Students will be expected to undertake around 70 hours of reading for the course, plus 40 hours preparing and producing the assessed work, and up to 10 further hours for field trips. This adds up to a total workload of some 150 hours for the course.

### **2. Aims, objectives, and assessment**

#### **2.1. Aims**

This course aims to:

- Engage students with different kinds of source material (textual, visual, material, spoken, and spatial), their contributions, demands, and limitations.
- Provide conceptual and practical ability in current qualitative research methods in heritage studies and archaeology.
- Develop critical faculties to assess (in debate and in writing) inter-disciplinary research, focusing on theory, practice, and quality of evidence.
- Introduce students to major ethical debates in heritage studies and archaeology.
- Examine the ways in which evidentiary sources and their treatments vary across global and situational contexts.
- Equip students to design research projects that are methodologically rigorous and ethically sound.

#### **2.2. Objectives**

On successful completion of this course a student should be able to:

- Examine textual, oral, visual, and material bodies of evidence and their relation to specific research questions.
- Demonstrate a good comprehension of key themes and debates in qualitative research methodologies as they are employed in heritage studies and archaeology.
- Critically analyse inter-disciplinary research and the treatment of evidence therein.

- Gain insight into the diversity and sensitivities of qualitative research methods and their applications in different contexts.
- Write ethics protocols cognisant of subjects' rights and vulnerabilities.
- Design research strategies grounded in a critical methodological framework, and utilising a well-reasoned and appropriate suite of qualitative tools.

## 2.3. Learning outcomes

On successful completion of this course a student should have developed:

- Critical engagement with primary and secondary sources.
- Reference skills, especially pertaining to diverse sources and their relevant institutions.
- Hands-on learning skills.
- Observation and critical reflection.
- Writing critical essays (from the research essay assignment).
- Designing and writing proposals (from the project proposal assignment).

## 2.4. Coursework

### 2.4.1. Assessment tasks

This course is assessed by means of a total of 4,000 words of coursework, divided into one essay of 1,900-2,100 words and one research proposal of 1,900-2,100 words. The topics and deadlines for each assessment are specified below.

### Assignments

1. **A research proposal of 1,900-2,100 words.** This is designed to simulate as closely as possible a proposal to a social science funding body for the purposes of securing a grant either for academic or industry research. Your proposal will be assessed based on your ability to identify and state a research question, and design a well-reasoned, coherent, and relevant programme of data collection and analysis to address this question. Your proposal should respond to the guidelines and questions laid out in a 'Call for Proposals' that will be circulated several weeks prior to the deadline, and that will roughly follow the format of the British Academy/Leverhulme Small Grants scheme (details can be found here: <https://www.britac.ac.uk/sites/default/files/FINAL%20-%20SRG%20scheme%20notes%20for%20applicants%202018%20round.pdf>, and here: <https://www.britac.ac.uk/ba-leverhulme-small-research-grants>). While you do not have to include a budget, your proposal must be designed in such a way as to stay below a £10,000 limit. Your proposal will include the following sections:
  1. Title of research
  2. Research abstract. *No more than 150 words.*
  3. Starting date and end date
  4. Proposed research programme and plan of action, including context and research objectives of the proposed study, the methodology used, and a realistic research programme, including the activities that will take place, and explaining how these will contribute to the achievement of the research objectives. *No more than 1,600 words.*

5. Ethics protocols, including identifying vulnerable participants or special conditions that you will need to fulfil. *No more than 250 words.*

The assignment makes up **one half of the course marks**. **Submission deadline: 14 March 2019.**

2. **An essay of 1,900-2,100 words.** Scenario: You are responsible for interpreting an archaeological site, archaeological assemblage, museum collection, or heritage site of your choice. Your essay will describe two distinct approaches that you could take in order to achieve this. Each approach that you outline should include: background information about the essay's subject, a critical analysis of the source materials and methods that you will use for each interpretation, the shortcomings and advantages of these, and where the approaches you describe may contradict or complement each other. As there is no set essay title for this assignment, you are encouraged to take advantage of the opportunity to explore source materials and/or subjects in archaeology and heritage that interest you. If you would like to treat this essay as a preparatory or exploratory work for your dissertation research, please feel free to do so. I am available for consultation about essay topics until *two weeks* before the submission deadline. The assignment makes up **one half of the course marks**. **Submission deadline: 10 May 2019.**

If students are unclear about the nature of an assignment, they should discuss this with the Course Co-ordinators.

Students are not permitted to re-write and re-submit essays in order to try to improve their marks. However, students may be permitted to submit for comment a brief outline of the assignment, provided this is planned suitably in advance of the submission date.

Please note that in order to be deemed to have completed and passed in any course, it is necessary to submit all assessments.

#### 2.4.2. Word counts

The following should not be included in the word count: title page, contents pages, lists of figures and tables, abstract, preface, acknowledgements, bibliography, lists of references, captions and contents of tables and figures, and appendices.

Penalties will only be imposed if you exceed the upper figure in the range. There is no penalty for using fewer words than the lower figure in the range: the lower figure is simply for your guidance to indicate the sort of length that is expected.

In the 2018-19 session penalties for overlength work will be as follows:

- For work that exceeds the specified maximum length by less than 10% the mark will be reduced by five percentage marks, but the penalised mark will not be reduced below the pass mark, assuming the work merited a Pass.
- For work that exceeds the specified maximum length by 10% or more the mark will be reduced by ten percentage marks, but the penalised mark will not be reduced below the pass mark, assuming the work merited a Pass.

#### 2.5. Coursework submission procedures.

- All coursework must normally be submitted **both as hard copy and electronically**. (The only exceptions are bulky portfolios and lab books which are normally submitted as hard copy only.)

- You should staple the appropriate colour-coded IoA coversheet (available in the IoA library and outside room 411a) to the front of each piece of work and submit it to the red box at the Reception Desk.
- All coursework should be uploaded to Turnitin by midnight on the day of the deadline. This will date-stamp your work. It is essential to upload **all parts** of your work as this is sometimes the version that will be marked.
- Instructions are given below.

Note that Turnitin uses the term 'class' for what we normally call a 'course'.

1. Ensure that your essay or other item of coursework has been saved as a Word doc., docx. or PDF document, and that you have the Class ID for the course (available from the course handbook) and enrolment password (this is **IoA1819** for all courses this session - note that this is capital letter I, lower case letter o, upper case A, followed by the current academic year)
2. Click on [http://www.turnitinuk.com/en\\_gb/login](http://www.turnitinuk.com/en_gb/login)
3. Click on 'Create account'
4. Select your category as 'Student'
5. Create an account using your UCL email address. Note that you will be asked to specify a new password for your account - do not use your UCL password or the enrolment password, but invent one of your own (Turnitin will permanently associate this with your account, so you will not have to change it every 6 months, unlike your UCL password). In addition, you will be asked for a "Class ID" and a "Class enrolment password" (see point 1 above).
6. Once you have created an account you can just log in at [http://www.turnitinuk.com/en\\_gb/login](http://www.turnitinuk.com/en_gb/login) and enrol for your other classes without going through the new user process again. Simply click on 'Enrol in a class'. Make sure you have all the relevant "class IDs" at hand.
7. Click on the course to which you wish to submit your work.
8. Click on the correct assignment (e.g. Essay 1).
9. Double-check that you are in the correct course and assignment and then click 'Submit'
10. Attach document as a "Single file upload"
11. Enter your name (the examiner will not be able to see this)
12. Fill in the "Submission title" field with the right details: **It is essential that the first word in the title is your examination candidate number** (e.g. YGBR8 In what sense can culture be said to evolve?),
13. Click "Upload". When the upload is finished, you will be able to see a text-only version of your submission.
14. Click on "Submit"

If you have problems, please email the IoA Turnitin Advisers on [ioa-turnitin@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:ioa-turnitin@ucl.ac.uk), explaining the nature of the problem and the exact course and assignment involved.

One of the Turnitin Advisers will normally respond within 24 hours, Monday-Friday during term. Please be sure to email the Turnitin Advisers if technical problems prevent you from uploading work in time to meet a submission deadline - even if you do not obtain an immediate response from one of the Advisers they will be able to notify the relevant Course Coordinator that you had attempted to submit the work before the deadline.

### 3. Schedule and syllabus

#### 3.1. Teaching schedule

#### Session 1. Introduction: Research and its subjects

Rachel King and Veysel Apaydin

Research is about making knowledge, so how do we go about doing this and what are the choices that lead us to different kinds of data? In this session we are introduced to these themes, which underpin this course and which we will spend the next 10 weeks exploring. Archaeology as a discipline is notorious for being, in Barbara Voss's (2007) words, 'promiscuous' in its use of multiple different kinds of evidence. Similarly, heritage studies as a sub-field is characterised by engaging with a huge range of diverse source materials, and by borrowing methods for interpreting these from cognate fields like anthropology, material culture studies, history, media studies, and sociology. Understanding not only how to *produce* research in heritage and archaeology but also how to *read and use* existing work means critically examining what information is available from sources, how that information is accessed, and what it is being made to do. This course is about helping you to assemble a research 'toolkit', as well as learning to think rigorously about the ethics of that toolkit and opportunities for expanding it or relating it to work in your broader field.

We begin by considering together the different types of sources that archaeologists and heritage specialists engage with, and speculate together on what some uses and limitations of these might be. We then consider some basic concepts in analysing any sort of data and data collection (for example, the difference between a method and a methodology), and how we translate research theory into research practice, with reference to a few concrete examples. In doing this, we learn to recognise our familiarity with and preconceptions of what makes valid research methods, and commit to interrogating these during the rest of the course. We discuss the course structure, handbook readings, requirements, and assignments.

### Essential readings

Graves-Brown, P., Harrison, R., and Piccini, A. 2013. Introduction. In P. Graves-Brown, R. Harrison, and A. Piccini (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Contemporary World*, pp. 1-23. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lydon, J. and Rizvi, U.Z. 2010. Introduction: Postcolonialism and archaeology. In J. Lydon and U.Z. Rizvi (eds.), *Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology*, pp. 17-33. London: Routledge.

Stig Sørensen, M.L. and Carman, J. 2008. Introduction: Making the means transparent. Reasons and reflections. In M.L. Stig Sørensen and J. Carman (eds.), *Heritage Studies: Methods and Approaches*, pp. 3-10. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

### Further readings

Rizvi, U.Z. 2006. Accounting for multiple desires: Decolonizing methodologies, archaeology, and the public interest. *India Review* 5: 394-416.

Winter, T. 2013. Clarifying the critical in critical heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 19 (6): 532-545.

#### *Works using mixed methods:*

Dante, A. 2017. Histories of a burnt house: An archaeology of negative spaces. *American Anthropologist* 119 (2): 253-268.

King, R. 2017. Living on edge: New perspectives on anxiety, refuge, and colonialism in southern Africa. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 27 (3): 533-551.

Meskel, L. 2018. *A Future in Ruins: UNESCO, World Heritage, and the Dream of Peace*. New York: Oxford University Press.

## **Session 2. Ethnography and its discontents**

Rachel King

While ethnography is sometimes seen as the core method of anthropology, its research value, potential, and even its definition are actually highly contested. In the 1980s (fuelled by Edward Said's 1978 critique of Orientalism), a 'crisis of representation' among Western anthropologists prompted questions of longstanding ethnographic practices, which involved long-term observations of non-Western people reported as objective facts: Can ethnographers influence the subjects of their research just by studying them? Could such observations actually be highly conditioned by ethnographers' own research questions and frames of reference? These and other questions prompted James Clifford and George Marcus (1986) to argue that ethnography is not, in fact, a method but a literary genre – a style of writing about people composed of images, texts, and periods of 'hanging out' that will always remove or distance research subjects from the final written work.

In this session, we take up Clifford and Marcus' critique, and examine the characteristics of the ethnography as style vs method debate. We ask why ethnography is so appealing to archaeologists and heritage specialists: because of its emphasis on fieldwork, its open-ended discussions, its flexible time commitments? We then consider the importance of the field in ethnographic work: why (as Tim Ingold (2014) has argued) is it so important to keep our research context at the forefront of our analysis, and how does ethnography permit or limit this? Finally, we turn to the related method of participant observation and explore how this differs from ethnography. We discuss what 'observation' actually entails and how to translate this into data.

**Seminar task:** As a group, we will analyse and discuss a piece of ethnographic writing – see readings below for details.

**Seminar readings – NB. You must read these in order to participate in the seminar.**

Hammersley, M. 2014. *Reading Ethnographic Research: A Critical Guide*, **chapter 1**. London: Routledge.

Straight, B. 2005. In the belly of history: Memory, forgetting, and the hazards of reproduction. *Africa* 75 (1): 83-104.

#### Essential readings

Mann, A., Mol, A., Satakar, P., Savirani, A., Selim, N., Sur, M., Yates-Doerr, E. 2011. Mixing methods, tasting fingers: Notes on an ethnographic experiment. *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 1 (1): 221-243.

Skinner, J. (ed.) 2012. *The Interview: An Ethnographic Approach*, **chapter 2**. London: Berg. (Available as an Ebook via UCL Library Services.)

#### Further readings

*Anthropologists on ethnographic writing:*

Chua, L., High, C., and Lau, T. 2008. Introduction: Questions of evidence. In L. Chua, C. High, and T. Lau (eds), *How Do We Know?: Evidence, Ethnography, and the Making of Anthropological Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Clifford, J. and Marcus, G.E. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, **especially chapter 5**. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Davies, C.A. 2008. *Reflexive Ethnography: A Guide to Researching Selves and Others*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ingold, T. 2014. That's enough about ethnography! *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4 (1): 383-395.

Marcus, G.E. 2016. Multi-sited ethnography: Notes and queries. In M.-A. Falzon (ed.), *Multi-Sited Ethnography: Theory, Praxis, and Locality in Contemporary Research*. London: Routledge.

#### *The Field:*

Astuti, R. 2017. On keeping up the tension between fieldwork and ethnography. *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 7 (1): 9-14.

Clifford, J. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*, **chapter 3**. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gupta, A. and Ferguson, J. 1997. Discipline and practice: 'The Field' as site, method, and location in anthropology. In A. Gupta and J. Ferguson (eds), *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

#### *Participant observation:*

Emerson, R.M., Fretz, R.I., and Shaw, L.L. 2001. Participant observation and fieldnotes. In P. Atkinson (ed.), *Handbook of Ethnography*. London: Sage.

Shah, A. 2017. Ethnography? Participant observation, a potentially revolutionary praxis. *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 7 (1): 54-59.

#### *Auto-ethnography and reversed gazes:*

Abu-Lughod, L. Fieldwork of a dutiful daughter. In S. Altorki and C.F. El-Solh (eds), *Arab Women in the Field: Studying Your Own Society*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Narayan, K. 1993. How native is a 'native' anthropologist?. *American Anthropologist* 95 (3): 671-686.

Ntarangwi, M. 2010. *Reversed Gaze: An African Ethnography of American Anthropology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

#### *Heritage ethnographies:*

Gordillo, G. 2014. *Rubble: The Afterlife of Destruction*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Meskell, L. 2011. *The Nature of Heritage: The New South Africa*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

#### *Archaeology and ethnography:*

Hamilakis, Y. 2011. Archaeological ethnography: A multitemporal meeting ground for archaeology and anthropology. *Annual Reviews of Anthropology* 40: 399-414.

Hollowell, J. and Nicholas, G. 2009. Using ethnographic methods to articulate community-based conceptions of cultural heritage management, *Public Archaeology* 8 (2-3): 141-160.

## **Session 3. Observation, participation, and other ways of hanging out**

Veysel Apaydin

The last several decades have witnessed growth in the number of methods available for social research in heritage studies. Meanwhile, increasing interest in heritage studies research has driven the question: 'how should we approach these methods effectively in the field?' Particularly, it is important to focus on collecting data in the most effective way in different situations, and which method(s) are deliver more detailed given the particular cultural settings of different communities or specific aspects or types of material culture, In heritage studies, the main data collection

methods are observation, participatory observation, interview, and survey. In this lecture, we establish foundational knowledge of field methods. For each one we consider the theoretical and practical knowledge that must accompany them to ensure they are effective and appropriate. We bring several sociological and heritage case studies to demonstrate the differences between data collected using each method and discuss benefits of applying one method or combination of all these methods in the field to specific types of research questions.

### Essential reading

Fries, C. J. 2009. Bourdieu's reflexive sociology as a theoretical basis for mixed methods research: An application to complementary and alternative medicine. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 3: 326–348.

Madison, S. 2018. *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics, and Performance, Introduction chapter* Los Angeles: SAGE.

Schrauf, R. 2016. Mixed methods cross-cultural research and discourse. In *Mixed Methods: Interviews, Surveys, and Cross-Cultural Comparisons*, pp. 1-22. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781316544914.002.

### Further reading

Apaydin, V. 2018. Critical community engagement in heritage studies. In C. Smith (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of World Archaeology, Volume II*. London: Springer.

Bernard, H.R. 2006. *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 4th ed., **Introduction**. New York: Altamira Press.

Bernard, H.R. (ed.) 2011. *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Bryman, A. 2006. Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: How is it done? *Qualitative Research* 6: 97–113.

Cohen, A.P. 1985. *The symbolic construction of community, Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Corbin, J. and Strauss, A. 2007. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*, 3rd ed. Walnut Creek, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J.W. 2003. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J.W. 2015. *A Concise Introduction to Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J.W. and Plano Clark, V.L. 2010. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J.W., Plano Clark, V.L., Gutmann, M.L., and Hanson, W.E. 2003. Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkori and C. Teddlie (eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Research*, pp. 209–240. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gubrium, J.F. and Holstein, J. (eds.) 2002. *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Jones, J. 2017. Wrestling with the social value of heritage: Problems, dilemmas and opportunities. *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage*, 4:1, 21-37, DOI: 10.1080/20518196.2016.1193996

Lewis-Beck, M.S., Bryman, A., and Futing Liao, T. 2004. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd, DOI: 10.4135/9781412950589

## **Session 4. Data analysis and interpretation**

Veysel Apaydin

Analysis of data collected during social research in heritage contexts, particularly during interviews, observation, and participatory observation investigations can be very complex. Often data consists of non-numeric, non-quantifiable information collected through notes, videos, audio recordings and text documents. Qualitative data analysis is therefore a critical skill in heritage studies, and in this course we will introduce analytical techniques such as content, narrative and discourse analysis. Although qualitative data analysis and interpretation depend on the researchers' critical skills, there are certain formal steps that can be followed: creating response codes, finding themes, analyzing relationships between themes, and even in interpretation. These steps can be facilitated through analytical and text-processing software such as SPSS and NVivo. Additionally, quantitative data collection through surveys/questionnaires also forms a significant part of heritage research and needs to be considered in-depth when used in heritage studies with reflection on data collection methods and structures. In this lecture, we discuss how to maximise the potential for robust data analyses in heritage research using both qualitative and quantitative analytical techniques.

### Essential reading

Mauthner, N.S. and Doucet, A. 2003. Reflexive accounts and accounts of reflexivity in qualitative data analysis. *Sociology* 37 (3): 413–31, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/00380385030373002>.

Maxwell, J. and Chmiel, M. 2014. Notes toward a theory of qualitative data analysis. In U. Flick (ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, pp. 21-34. London: SAGE Publications Ltd., DOI: 10.4135/9781446282243.

### Further reading

Barbour, R. 2014. Analysing focus groups. In U. Flick (ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, pp. 313-326. London: SAGE Publications Ltd., DOI: 10.4135/9781446282243.

Bazeley, P. and Jackson, K. 2013. *Qualitative Data Analysis with NVivo*. Los Angeles and London: SAGE.

Boyatzis, R.E. 1998. *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. London: Sage.

Coffey, A. 2014. Analysing documents. In U. Flick (ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, pp. 367-379. London: SAGE Publications Ltd., DOI: 10.4135/9781446282243.

Connoaly, P. 2007. *Quantitative Data Analysis in Education*. London: Routledge.

Hosking, D.M. and Pluut, B. 2010. (Re) constructing reflexivity: A relational constructivist approach. *The Qualitative Report* 15 (1): 59–75.

Kowal, S. and O'Connell, D. 2014. Transcription as a crucial step of data analysis. In U. Flick (ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, pp. 64-78. London: SAGE Publications Ltd., DOI: 10.4135/9781446282243

Kreuz, R.J. and Riordan, M.A. 2011. The transcription of face-to-face interaction. In W. Bublitz and N.R. Norrick (eds.), *Foundations of Pragmatics*, pp. 657-679. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Marvasti, A. 2014. Analysing observations. In U. Flick (ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, pp. 354-366. London: SAGE Publications Ltd., DOI: 10.4135/9781446282243.

May, T. and Perry, B. 2011. *Social Research and Reflexivity: Content, Consequences and Context*. London: Sage. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446250372>.

May, T. & Perry, B. 2014. Reflexivity and the practice of qualitative research. In U. Flick (ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, pp. 109-122. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. DOI: 10.4135/9781446282243.

Mruck, K. and Mey, G. 2007. Grounded theory and reflexivity. In A. Bryant and K. Charmaz (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory*, pp. 515-538. London: Sage.

Rapley, T. 2014. Sampling strategies in qualitative research. In U. Flick (ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, pp. 49-63. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. DOI: 10.4135/9781446282243.

Roulston, K. 2014. Analysing interviews. In U. Flick (ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, pp. 297-312. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. DOI: 10.4135/9781446282243.

Toerien, M. 2014. Conversations and conversation analysis. In U. Flick (ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, pp. 327-340. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. DOI: 10.4135/9781446282243.

Willig, C. 2012. *Qualitative Interpretation and Analysis in Psychology*. Maidenhead: Open University Press/McGraw-Hill.

Willig, C. 2014. Interpretation and analysis1. In U. Flick (ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, pp. 136-150. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. DOI: 10.4135/9781446282243.

## **Session 5. The Only Way Is Ethics**

Rachel King and Veysel Apaydin

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, heritage and archaeology saw huge transformations in how ethical research practices were conceived. Building on momentum from the feminist and multi-vocal archaeologies of the 1990s, this movement rejected the narrow definition of ethics as codes of practice driven by scientific associations, and argued for a broader view of research practice as embedded within a web of stakeholders and obligations. The result has been in-depth, critical conversations not only about the ethical issues of working with human subjects, but of the contexts we work in and the questions we ask. Moreover, there is now a widespread awareness of the need to treat ethical protocols not simply as 'tick-box' exercises in research, but as something built into project design from the outset.

We begin this session in the aftermath of the ethical turn of the early 2000s, and consider Tracy Ireland and John Schofield's (2015) division of ethical obligations into three strands: stewardship, stakeholders, and the discipline. We discuss how to assess the risks our work poses to each of these constituencies, and what resources are available for managing these risks at multiple scales. These resources include ethics forums and human subjects research committees. Finally, we consider the concept of 'co-production' – the idea of placing participants as central partners in research – and how this can shift ethical obligations, or whether we can even think of it as an ethical obligation in itself.

**Seminar task:** We will do a group activity on ethical questions and scenarios. To prepare for this, please take the time to explore the American Anthropological Association Ethics Blog (link below) and browse various tabs and situations described.

[Essential readings](#)

American Anthropological Association Ethics Blog, articles tagged 'practicing/applied':  
<http://ethics.americananthro.org/category/practicingapplied/>

Watkins, J. 2005. Through wary eyes: Indigenous perspectives on archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34: 429-449.

### Further readings

Apaydin, V and Hassett, B. 2018. Should I stay or should I go. Ideals and realities of archaeology in the conflict regions. *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage*. PDF on Moodle.

Battiste, M. 2007. Research ethics for protecting indigenous knowledge and heritage: Institutional and research responsibilities. In N.K. Denzin and M.D. Giardina (eds.), *Ethical Futures in Qualitative Research: Decolonizing the Politics of Knowledge*, pp. 111-132. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Christians, C.G. 2011. Ethics and politics in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 4th edn., pp. 61-80. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, C. and Ferguson, T.J. 2004. Virtue ethics and the practice of history: Native Americans and archaeologists along the San Pedro Valley of Arizona. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 4 (1): 5-27.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, C. and Ferguson, T.J. (eds) 2008. *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira.

González-Ruibal, A. 2018. Ethics of archaeology, *Annual Review of Anthropology* (47).

Ireland, T. and Schofield, J. (eds) 2015. *The Ethics of Cultural Heritage*. New York: Springer.

Giblin, J.D., King, R., and Smith, B. (eds) 2014. Special issue: The Ethics of Archaeology in Africa, *Azania: Archaeological Research in Africa* 49 (2).

Jopela, A. and Fredriksen, P.D. 2015. Public archaeology, knowledge making, and heritage ethics in southern Africa: An approach from Mozambique. *World Archaeology* 47 (2): 261-284.

Kreps, C. 2011. Redefining the rules of the road: Post-colonialism and the new ethics of museum anthropology, in J. Marstine (ed.) *The Routledge Companion to Museum Ethics: Redefining Ethics for the Twenty-First Century Museum*. London: Routledge.

Meskell, L. 2005. Introduction. In L. Meskell and P. Pels (eds.), *Embedding Ethics*. London: Berg.

## **Session 6. Visual and popular cultures**

With guest lecturer Colin Sterling, UCL

This session introduces a broad range of methods and approaches for researching visual and popular culture in heritage studies. Using grounded and up-to-date case studies, we will consider: the role of the visual in the production and consumption of heritage; the relationship between heritage and the arts; the impact of film and television on conceptions of the past in the present; the potential for critical-creative methods to shape heritage research and practice. Working in groups, we will read and analyse a selection of 'texts' (e.g. films, photographs, popular books, marketing campaigns) related to the heritage field (broadly understood). This approach aims to expand the remit of heritage studies beyond the museum and the archaeological site, and students are encouraged to spend some time before the session thinking about books, artworks, films, television shows etc. they are familiar with that might be considered from this perspective. Finally – in line with the aims of the course as a whole – a key objective of this session is to promote innovative and experimental research that connects theory and practice at the forefront of

heritage thinking. To this end, we will consider recent questions around socially engaged methods and creative practices in different heritage domains.

### Essential readings

Cabañes, J.V.A., 2017. Telling migrant stories in collaborative photography research: Photographic practices and the mediation of migrant voices. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 1367877917733542. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367877917733542>

Watson, S. and Waterton, E. 2010. Reading the visual: Representation and narrative in the construction of heritage. *Material Culture Review* 71(Spring), 84-97. Available online: <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/MCR/article/view/18377/19839>

Waysdorf, A., and Reijnders, S. 2018. Immersion, authenticity and the theme park as social space: Experiencing the Wizarding World of Harry Potter. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 21, 173–188. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367877916674751>

### Recommended readings

Barthes, R. 2000 [1972]. *Mythologies*. Translated by Jonathan Cape. London: Vintage.

Dicks, B. 2014. Action, experience, communication: Three methodological paradigms for researching multimodal and multisensory settings. *Qualitative Research* 14, 656–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794113501687>

Kuhn, A. 2007. Photography and cultural memory: A methodological exploration. *Visual Studies* 22, 283–292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14725860701657175>

Parikka, J. 2013. *What is Media Archaeology?* John Wiley & Sons.

Rose, G. 2016. *Visual Methodologies*, Fourth edition. ed. Sage Publications Ltd, London.

Waterton, E. & Watson, S. 2014. *The Semiotics of Heritage Tourism*. Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto: Channel View Publications.

### Further readings

Alasuutari, P. 1995. *Researching Culture*. London: Sage.

Albers, P.C. and James, W.J.. 1988. Travel Photography: A Methodological Approach. *Annals of Tourism Research* 15: 134-158.

Bal, M. 1996. *Double Exposures: The Subject of Cultural Analysis*. London and New York: Routledge

Banks, M. and Zeitlyn, D. 2015. *Visual Methods in Social Research*, Second edition. Sage Publications Ltd, London: Thousand Oaks, California.

Barrett, E. and Bolt, B. 2010. *Practice as Research: Approaches to Creative Arts Enquiry*. I.B.Tauris: London.

Basu, P. 2013. Memoryscapes and multi-sited methods. In E. Keightley and M. Pickering (eds.), *Research Methods for Memory Studies*, pp. 115-131. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (ed.) 1996. *Photography: A Middle-brow Art*, New Ed edition. Polity: Cambridge.

Crang, M. 1997. Picturing practices: Research through the tourist gaze. *Progress in Human Geography* 21(3): 359-373.

Crouch, D. and Lübbren, N. 2003. *Visual Culture and Tourism*. Oxford: Berg.

Denzin, N.K. 2008. *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. London: Sage.

Edensor, T. 1998. *Tourists at the Taj: Performance and Meaning at a Symbolic Site*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Edwards, E. and Hart, J. (eds.) 2004. *Photographs Objects Histories: On the Materiality of Images*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Emmison, M. and Smith, P. 2000. *Researching the Visual*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fox, N.J. and Alldred, P. 2015. New materialist social inquiry: Designs, methods and the research-assemblage. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 18: 399–414. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2014.921458>
- Gabrys, J. 2013. *Digital Rubbish: A Natural History of Electronics*, Reprint edition. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Gauntlett, D. and Holzwarth, P. 2006. Creative and visual methods for exploring identities. *Visual Studies* 21: 82–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14725860600613261>
- Geiger, J. and Rutsky, R.L. 2013. *Film Analysis: A Norton Reader*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Hall, S. (ed.) 1997. *Representation: Cultural Representation and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage Publications and Open University.
- Hall, S. Whannel, P., and Dyer, R. 2018. *The Popular Arts*, Reprint edition. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hine, C. 2015. *Ethnography for the Internet*. London: Bloombury.
- Keightley, E., and Pickering, M. 2013. *Research Methods for Memory Studies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Landy, M. (ed.), 2001. *Historical Film: History and Memory in the Media*. London: The Athlone Press.
- Lutz, C. and Collins, J. 1991. The photograph as an intersection of gazes: The example of National Geographic. *Visual Anthropology Review* 7(1): 134-149.
- Margolis, E., and Pauwels, L. 2011. *The SAGE Handbook of Visual Research Methods*. London: Sage.
- Marion, J.S. and Crowder, J.S. 2013. *Visual Research: A Concise Introduction to Thinking Visually*. London: Bloomsbury.
- McGuigan, J. (ed.) 1997. *Cultural Methodologies*. London: Sage.
- Mitchell, C. 2011. *Doing Visual Research*, First edition. London: Sage.
- Monk, C. 1995. The British “heritage film” and its critics. *Critical Survey* 7: 116–124.
- Monk, D.C. 2012. *Heritage Film Audiences: Period Films and Contemporary Audiences in the UK*, Reprint edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Pickering, M. (ed.) 2008. *Research Methods for Cultural Studies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Pink, S. 2003. Interdisciplinary agendas in visual research: re-situating visual anthropology. *Visual Studies* 18: 179–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14725860310001632029>
- Pink, S. 2005. *The Future of Visual Anthropology: Engaging the Senses*, First edition. London: Routledge.
- Pink, S., Horst, H., Postill, J., Hjorth, L., Lewis, T., and Tacchi, J. 2015. *Digital Ethnography: Principles and Practice*, First edition. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Radstone, S. (ed.), 2000. *Memory and Methodology*, First Edition. Oxford: Berg 3PL.
- Ryan, M. and Lenos, M. 2012. *An Introduction to Film Analysis: Technique and Meaning in Narrative Film*. New York and London: Continuum.

- Samuel, R. 2012. *Theatres of Memory: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture*, Second Revised edition. London: Verso Books, especially final chapter on film and heritage.
- Saukko, P. 2003. *Doing Research in Cultural Studies : An Introduction to Classical and New Methodological Approaches*. London: Sage.
- Seale, C. (ed.) 2011. *Researching Society and Culture*, Third edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sørensen, M.L.S. and Carman, J. (eds.) 2009. *Heritage Studies: Methods and Approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Sterling, C. 2017. Mundane myths: Heritage and the politics of the photographic cliché. *Public Archaeology* 1-16
- Vidal, B. 2012. *Heritage Film: Nation, Genre, and Representation*. Wallflower Press.
- Waterton, E. 2009. Sights of sites: Picturing heritage, power and exclusion. *Journal of Heritage Tourism* 4: 37–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17438730802221117>
- Watson, S. and Waterton, E. (eds.) 2010. *Culture, Heritage and Representation: Perspectives on Visuality and the Past*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Watson, S. and Waterton, E (eds.) 2015. *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*, First edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

## **Session 7. Landscapes: Data, dwellings, or dangerous ground?**

Rachel King

Landscapes, Barbara Bender (2002) tells us, are never just ‘out there’, they ‘can never stand still’, and ‘they are always subjective’. Landscape theories that took hold from the late twentieth century (heavily derived from phenomenological theory) tell us that landscapes are not just artefacts; they are always actively co-created by humans and non-humans, and peoples’ experiences of them are culturally mediated. It follows, then, that landscapes can serve as powerful sources of information about how people conceive of place, identity, well-being, and home. Technological advances like the prevalence of satellite imaging, global positioning systems (GPS), and geographic information systems (GIS) have broadened the range of tools available for extracting increasingly large amounts of detail from landscapes. This proliferation of geographical tools has changed the ways we assess, document, and curate landscape features, and have raised additional questions about both how to query the cultural elements of landscapes and the ethics of doing so.

Building on Bender’s notion of landscapes as active and ‘always on the move’, we begin by considering some ways in which landscapes are cultural spaces, and how these can be expressed through different forms of data, which in turn command a wide suite of analytical tools. We then examine how these cultural properties of landscape intersect with trends in managing and preserving landscapes as limited resources. We focus on how landscapes-as-data relate to landscapes-as-resources, and explore some recent trends in reconciling these two perspectives from Australia, China, and UNESCO. These include UNESCO’s emphasis on linking landscapes with intangible heritage to create ‘heritage landscapes’.

**Seminar task:** We will do a group activity on memory and participatory mapping.

### Essential readings

- Samuels, J. 2017. After wheat: Revitalizing Sicilian agriculture through heritage tourism, *Culture, Agriculture, Food & Environment* 39 (2): 90-99.
- Moylan, E., Brown, S., and Kelly, C. 2009. Toward a cultural landscape atlas: Representing all the landscape as cultural, *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 15 (5): 447-466.
- Getty Conservation Institute, 2016 film ‘Preserving the Mogao Cave Temples Site’, available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3Zm77D-iX6c>.

### Further readings

Baird, M.F. 2013. 'The breath of the mountain is my heart': Indigenous cultural landscapes and the politics of heritage, *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 19 (4): 327-340.

English, T. 2002. *The Sea and the Rock Gives Us a Feed: Mapping and Managing Gumbaingirr Wild Resource Use Places*. Sydney: NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service. Available online at <http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/cultureheritage/GumbaingirrTheSeaAndTheRockGivesUsAFeed.pdf>.

Harrison, R. 2004. *Shared Landscapes*. Sydney: UNSW Press. Available online at [http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/cultureheritage/Shared\\_Landscapes.pdf](http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/cultureheritage/Shared_Landscapes.pdf).

King, R. and Nic Eoin, L. 2014. Before the flood: Loss of place, mnemonics, and 'resources' ahead of the Metolong Dam, Lesotho, *Journal of Social Archaeology* 14 (2): 196-223.

Kleinitz, C. and Merlo, S. 2014. Towards a collaborative exploration of community heritage in archaeological salvage contexts: Participatory mapping on Mograt Island, Sudan, *Aus der Archäologie* 25: 161-175.

Langton, M. 2002. The edge of the sacred, the edge of death, in B. David and M. Wilson (eds) *Inscribed Landscapes: Marking and Making Place*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Thomas, E.J. and Ross, A. 2013. Mapping an archaeology of the present: Counter-mapping at the Gummingurru stone arrangement site, southeast Queensland, Australia, *Journal of Social Archaeology* 13(2): 220-241.

## **Session 8. Archives and historical texts**

Rachel King

While humans are arguably collectors and archivists by nature, the field of archive-making ('archival science') was born in the Enlightenment's focus on cataloguing and description as fundamental to understanding the order of the natural world. Until the mid-twentieth century, archives and archivists were treated as scientifically neutral: archivists were responsible for determining the meaning of records by revealing their contexts without any political or ideological influence. From the 1940s, however, scholars began to question whether the ordering of archives was ever impartial or separate from larger projects of controlling knowledge (and, by extension, power). By the 1990s archivists and philosophers like Jacques Derrida (1996) asserted that making records was anything but intellectually neutral, and that archives were actively implicated in excluding or privileging certain perspectives and reinforcing the power behind the archival institution (often the state). It follows, then, that working with archives isn't a simple matter of looking something up in a catalog, but requires asking questions of how and why the archive has been created.

We begin this session by confronting some of the assumptions we have about archives: that they are the same as libraries and databases. We examine the different ways archives manifest themselves and are created, the different sorts of power behind them, and how archives and archivists go about making meaning in their work. We then turn to the ways in which heritage specialists and archaeologists – for whom archival science may be only an occasional part of their practice – can acknowledge the subjectivity of archival records while still treating these as a useful set of sources. Finally, we consider how our own work can in itself constitute a sort of archive and what that means for how we treat and preserve data.

**Seminar task:** We will handle a set of archival materials and walk through how to go about extracting information from them. We will do this with reference to the essential readings for this session, so please be sure to consult these.

### Essential readings

Duff, W.M. and Harris, V. 2002. Stories and names: Archival description as narrating records and constructing meanings, *Archival Science* 2: 263-285.

King, R. In press. 'Were they half civilized?': Knowledge and reminiscence in the borderlands, in *Outlaws, Anxiety, and Disorder in Nineteenth-Century Southern Africa: Material Histories of the Maloti-Drakensberg Mountains*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. (PDF available on Moodle.)

#### Further readings

Butler, B. 2009. 'Othering' the archive – from exile to inclusion and heritage dignity: The case of Palestinian archival memory. *Archival Science* 9: 57-69.

Duff, W.M., Monks-Leeson, E., Galey A., and INKE Team. 2012. Contexts built and found: A pilot study on the process of archival meaning-making, *Archival Science* 12 (1): 69-62.

Fink, L.M. 2013. Museum archives as resources for scholarly research and institutional identity. In J. Marstine (ed.), *New Museum Theory and Practice. An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

King, R. 2017. Primary historical sources in archaeology: Methods. In T. Spear (ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of African History*. Available at <http://africanhistory.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190277734.001.0001/acrefore-9780190277734-e-214>.

Logan, A.L. 2016. 'Why can't people feed themselves?': Archaeology as alternative archive of food security in Banda, Ghana. *American Anthropologist* 118 (3): 508-524.

Hassett, B., Birch, S.P., Herridge, V., and Sykes, R.W. 2018. TrowelBlazers: Accidentally crowdsourcing an archive of women in archaeology. In V. Apaydin (ed.), *Shared Knowledge, Shared Power: Engaging Local and Indigenous Heritage*, pp. 129-141. Springer.

Meskell, L. 2016. World heritage and WikiLeaks: Territory, trade, and temples on the Thai-Cambodian border. *Current Anthropology* 57 (1): 72-95.

Voss, B.L. 2007. Image, text, object: Interpreting documents and artefacts as 'labours of representation'. *Historical Archaeology* 41 (4): 147-171.

Zeitlyn, D. 2012. Anthropology in and of the archives: Possible futures and contingent pasts. Archives as anthropological surrogates. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41: 461-480.

#### *Archival philosophy and meaning-making:*

Derrida, J. 1996. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, trans. E. Prenowitz. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stoler, A.L. 2009. *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

## **Session 9. The Internet and digital methods**

With guest lecturer Dan Pett, Fitzwilliam Museum

TBD

#### Essential readings

#### Further readings

## **Session 10. Fieldwork activity**

Rachel King and Veysel Apaydin

TBD

## APPENDIX A: POLICIES AND PROCEDURES 2018-19 (PLEASE READ CAREFULLY)

This appendix provides a short précis of policies and procedures relating to courses. It is not a substitute for the full documentation, with which all students should become familiar. For full information on Institute policies and procedures, see the following website:

<http://wiki.ucl.ac.uk/display/archadmin>

For UCL policies and procedures, see the **IoA Student Administration section of Moodle**.

### General matters

*Attendance:* You are expected to attend 100% of classes. A register will be taken at each class. If you are unable to attend a class, please notify the lecturer by e-mail. **This is especially important for Tier 4 visa holders, as unexcused absences may violate the terms of your visa.**

*Dyslexia:* If you have dyslexia or any other disability, please discuss with your lecturer whether there is any way in which they can help you. Students with dyslexia should indicate it on each coursework cover sheet.

### Coursework

*Late submission:* Late submission will be penalized in accordance with current UCL regulations, unless formal permission for late submission has been granted. The UCL penalties are as follows:

- The marks for coursework received up to two working days after the published date and time will incur a 10 percentage point deduction in marks (but no lower than the pass mark).
- The marks for coursework received no more than two working days and up to five working days after the published date and time will receive no more than the pass mark (40% for UG modules, 50% for PGT modules).
- Work submitted more than five working days after the published date and time, but before the second week of the third term will receive a mark of zero but will be considered complete.

*Granting of extensions:* Please note that there are strict UCL-wide regulations with regard to the granting of extensions for coursework. You are reminded that Course Co-ordinators are not permitted to grant extensions. All requests for extensions must be submitted on the appropriate UCL form, together with supporting documentation, via Judy Medrington's office and will then be referred on for consideration. Please be aware that the grounds that are acceptable are limited. Those with long-term difficulties should contact UCL Student Disability Services to make special arrangements. Please see the IoA website for further information. Additional information is given here <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/srs/academic-manual/c4/extenuating-circumstances/>

*Return of coursework and resubmission:* You should receive your marked coursework within one month of the submission deadline. If you do not receive your work within this period, or a written notification, notify the Academic Administrator. When your marked essay is returned to you, return it to the Course Co-ordinator within two weeks. You must retain a copy of all coursework submitted.

*Citing sources and avoiding plagiarism:* Coursework must be expressed in your own words, citing the exact source (**author, date and page number**; website address if applicable) of any ideas, information, diagrams, etc. that are taken from the work of others. This applies to all media (books, articles, websites, images, figures, etc.). **Any direct quotations from the work of others must be indicated as such by being placed between quotation marks.** Plagiarism is a very serious

irregularity, which can carry heavy penalties. It is your responsibility to abide by requirements for presentation, referencing, and avoidance of plagiarism. Make sure you understand definitions of plagiarism and the procedures and penalties as detailed in UCL regulations:  
<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/current-students/guidelines/plagiarism>.

### **Resources**

Please ensure you are signed up to the course on Moodle. For help with Moodle, please contact Charlotte Frearson ([c.frearson@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:c.frearson@ucl.ac.uk))

