ARCL0134
THEMES, THOUGHT AND THEORY IN WORLD ARCHAEOLOGY:
CURRENT TOPICS

2019-20 15 credits
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Essay deadline: Friday 1st May 2020

Target return date: Friday 29th May 2020

Co-ordinator: Prof Stephen Shennan
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GENERAL

This handbook contains introductory information about this module. Additional handouts may be provided. If you have queries, please consult the Co-ordinator. For general information about policies & procedures, see Appendix A at end of this document. If changes need to be made to module arrangements, these will be communicated by email. It is thus essential that you consult your UCL email regularly. PLEASE BRING THIS HANDOUT TO ALL CLASS SESSIONS.

AIMS, OBJECTIVES and LEARNING OUTCOMES

This module builds on the content of ARCL0133. Seminars examine selected current research topics normally explored within one or more theoretical frameworks. On successful completion of this module a student should: (a) have an understanding of theoretical issues in a range of central research domains of archaeology; (b) be aware of the reasons for debates about how to approach a particular kind of research and be able to form their own theoretical position; (c) be able to use the knowledge to develop an innovative PhD proposal or carry out sound work in their particular field of archaeology.

TEACHING METHODS

This 15 credit module will be taught weekly in 10 two hour sessions. The format is that of a seminar. This handout contains weekly readings, which students are expected to complete before class.

PREREQUISITES
Students planning to take this module will normally be expected previously to have taken ARCL0133 Themes, Thought and Theory in World Archaeology: Foundations, which provides relevant background material which will be built upon in this module.

WORKLOAD

There will be 20 hours of seminars. Students will be expected to spend around 80 hours doing the background reading and 50 hours in producing assessed work – in all, 150 hours for the module.

ASSESSMENT (see end of this document for further details)

This module is assessed by one essay of 3,800-4,200 words. Information on topics is given at the end of this handbook. The Module Co-ordinator will discuss an outline of the essay with the student in advance. If students are unclear about the nature of an assignment, they should discuss this with the Module Co-ordinator. Students are not permitted to re-write and re-submit essays in order to try to improve their marks.

Essay due dates:

Draft Outline (not assessed):
Due on Friday, 28 February 2020 via email or hardcopy.
As well as the title this should provide 1) the thesis of your proposed essay, 2) a brief and general outline of the main topics to be discussed, and 3) an annotated bibliography of 5-10 articles that are central to your proposed essay. It should be 1-2 sides in length.
Students should make an effort to see the coordinator in office hours, or at another time, between 2 March and 16 March, to discuss the outline. Alternatively, outlines can be discussed by email.

Essay (assessed):
Deadline: Friday 1st May 2020 (midnight)
The essay will be marked electronically so there is no need to submit a hard copy

Word counts

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

Penalties will 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 2019-20 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.

**Coursework submission procedures**

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 the version that will be marked.

Instructions are given below. Please note that the procedure has changed for 2019-20, and work is now submitted to Turnitin via Moodle.

1. Ensure that your essay or other item of coursework has been saved as a Word doc., docx. or PDF document. Please include the module code and your candidate number on every page as a header.
2. Go into the Moodle page for the module to which you wish to submit your work.
3. Click on the correct assignment (e.g. Essay 1),
4. 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 Essay 1), Note that this changes each year.
5. Click “Upload”.
6. Click on “Submit”
7. You should receive a receipt – please save this.
8. If you have problems, please email the IoA Turnitin Advisers on ioa-turnitin@ucl.ac.uk, explaining the nature of the problem and the exact module 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 Module Coordinator that you had attempted to submit the work before the deadline.
**SCHEDULE**
Sessions: Mondays 2-4, repeated 11-1 pm on Tuesdays, Room 410. A minimum attendance of 70% is required, except in the case of illness or other adverse circumstances which are supported by medical certificates or other documentation as appropriate. If any changes need to be made to the module arrangements, these will normally be communicated by e-mail. It is therefore essential that you consult your UCL e-mail account regularly.

**ARCL0134 Schedule – 2-4 Mondays, Room 412, and 11-1 Tuesdays, Room 410**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 and 14 January 2020</td>
<td>Death and Mortuary Behaviour</td>
<td>Mike Parker Pearson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 and 21 January</td>
<td>Artefacts: material culture, technology, art</td>
<td>Stephen Shennan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 and 28 January</td>
<td>Approaches to Trade, Exchange and Value</td>
<td>Andrew Bevan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and 4 February</td>
<td>Landscapes and regional systems</td>
<td>Todd Whitelaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 and 11 February</td>
<td>Archaeological Science</td>
<td>Stephen Shennan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17-21 February</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 and 25 February</td>
<td>Evolutionary Archaeology and Anthropology</td>
<td>Stephen Shennan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 and 3 March</td>
<td>Social Inequality</td>
<td>David Wengrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 and 10 March</td>
<td>The Archaeology of Religion</td>
<td>Elizabeth Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and 17 March</td>
<td>Identities</td>
<td>Stephen Shennan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 and 24 March</td>
<td>Archaeology, Politics and the Public</td>
<td>Mike Parker Pearson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Death and Mortuary Behaviour

The interpretation of burials and mortuary data is a central aspect of archaeology. On the one hand, physical anthropological analysis of skeletal remains can cast light on demographic and biological aspects of past peoples, such as life expectancy, general health, specific diseases, occupational injuries, and traumas. On the other hand, the study of the cultural treatment in death of individuals of known sex and age may throw light on aspects of social organisation and the cultural values attached to them, such as gender and age distinctions, rank and status. Early processual archaeologists concentrated on identifying generalising correspondences between treatment of the dead and social organisation. Post-processual critiques (and earlier ones, see Ucko 1969), drawing on the rich ethnographic literature, have argued that burial ritual does not simply reflect social organisation, but reflexively constructs it, through negotiation and re-affirmation or transformation.

Discussion questions
What are the main differences in the ways in which processual and post-processual archaeologists have treated burial archaeology?
How can we understand the relationship(s) between the dead community encountered archaeologically and the living community it came from?
The burial record is one of the few places where archaeologists (especially prehistorians) can sometimes deal with past individuals. How can we use this opportunity?
What problems arise from the fact that archaeology provides only a partial record of past mortuary rituals and their residues? Are they insuperable?

Essential


For further reading: death and mortuary behaviour


2 Artefacts: Material Culture, Technology, Style
Explaining variation in artefact assemblages is basic to archaeology. Concerns with relative chronology and culture areas were central to the culture-historical approaches of the 1930s-1950s. With processual archaeology, an emphasis on artefact functions and technology was part of a broader concern with functionalism; even styles were often viewed in quite functional terms. Dissatisfaction with these models, particularly as they applied to styles and symbolic meanings of artefacts, was basic to post-processual views. There also emerged new views of technology as a social process. In recent years the idea of ‘materiality’ has become central to artefact studies, linked to frameworks such as Latour’s Actor Network Theory.
Add Julian Thomas 2015 Antiquity paper next year

Discussion questions
What is craft specialization? How do we identify it?
How can we determine whether artefacts were prestige items?
How have ideas about technology changed in archaeology? What is a ‘chaine operatoire’?
How have archaeologists defined and interpreted style?
What do archaeologists mean by “material engagement” and “material entanglement?”
Why do some anthropologists and archaeologists say that things have ‘agency’?

Essential (try to read one under each heading)

Craft production and specialization

Technology

Style

Material engagement and entanglement
Hodder, I. 2011. Human-thing entanglement: towards an integrated archaeological perspective. Journal Royal Anthropological Institute, 17.1, 154-77. Online (See also the book ‘Entanglement’)
Case studies (read 1)


For further reading: artefacts, material culture, technology, art


Sillar, B. and Tite, M. 2000. The challenge of ‘technological choices’ for material science approaches in archaeology. *Archaeometry* 42.1:2-20. TC 2532, IoA Periodicals,


---

**Materiality**


Approaches to Trade, Exchange and Value

This week’s class considers theories of exchange and value with regard to how they have been applied to understand the transmission of material culture across space and over time. Trade has long been a core theoretical domain in which modern commentators have either asserted that we can use the tools of modern economics to understand past behaviour, or conversely and equally stridently, have asserted the “otherness” of “primitive” exchange mechanisms. Underpinning our understanding of past and present trade is also a wider issue of how tangible and intangible cultural products are given value in the first place. Value proves to be an ambiguous but powerful topic, with relevance to a host of other encountered during this module.

Discussion questions

How useful for archaeology are the anthropological concepts of reciprocity, redistribution and market exchange?
All interpretations of exchange involve concepts of ‘value’. Where do these concepts come from and how can we understand them?
What, if any, are the benefits of specialisation in regional exchange?
How does inequality in exchange arise (between individual, institutions or regions)? What are its implications?
How convincingly can we ascribe social contexts, specific actors and/or specific behaviours to the movements of ancient artefacts that we observe?

Essential

Sahlins, M. 1972. Stone Age Economics. Ch. 5. INST ARCH BD SAH

For further reading: trade, exchange and value


Mauss, M. 1925. The Gift.


Landscape and Regional Settlement Systems

Landscape studies have had a long history in archaeology, from Antiquarian regional inventories, to the large-scale survey projects of Processual archaeology, to the phenomenological perspectives explored through Interpretive approaches. In addition to the inter-disciplinary programmes of field surveys and environmental reconstruction of ancient landscapes which developed from the 1950s, there has been an increasing interest recently in symbolic landscapes, landscapes of power and the way in which landscapes are culturally perceived and defined, not least by the monuments and spatial distribution of activities in them. The readings focus primarily on the cultural dimensions of landscape and consider a range of approaches as a basis for the seminar discussion.

Discussion questions
Are economic and political models of settlement patterns, as exemplified by Site Catchment Theory and Central Place Theory, limited in relevance to Western, market economies?
Are idealised models, such as Central Place Theory, relevant to analysing real landscapes?
What are the fundamental bases for such models, and are they relevant to understanding past landscapes?
Are social and symbolic approaches to landscape incompatible with economic analyses?
Can a phenomenological approach to a landscape provide insight into how it was perceived and understood by individuals in the past?
Phenomenological and experiential approaches to landscape tend to focus on local scales. Can they help us to understand larger-scale patterning in regional landscapes?

Essential


For further reading: landscapes


5 Archaeological Science

In recent years archaeological science has expanded enormously, in both the number and range of its applications. In the past it was mainly associated with dating, on the one hand, and the analysis of inorganic materials to address such topics as early technologies or the identification of exchange, on the other. Recently the biological sciences that have made the running, especially isotope studies and studies of ancient DNA. In addition, computerised modelling methods based on the ideas of complex adaptive systems and using agent-based modelling (ABM) have become important. ‘Big Data’ has also begun to play a significant role in the characterisation of large-scale patterns in the archaeological record as large datasets have become increasingly available, together with methods for processing them. This session looks at the impact of these developments on archaeological theory.

Discussion questions
To what extent is archaeological science replacing archaeological theory in posing and answering archaeological questions?
Have biologists, especially geneticists, usurped the role of archaeologists in explaining patterns in prehistory?
One aspect of post-processualism was the social critique of archaeological interpretations. How can/should this react to the new developments in archaeological science?
In what ways are computational methods influencing archaeological theory and interpretation?

Essential

General


Computational approaches


Ancient DNA

Reich, D. 2018. Who We Are and How We Got Here. Oxford University Press. As well as one week loan copies there is now a short loan copy at ISSUE DESK IOA REI 2
Further reading


Plus, follow up some of the references that interest you in the readings above or browse recent issues of Journal of Archaeological Science or Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences.

If you’re thinking of doing your essay on this subject please contact me to discuss identifying particular areas of archaeological science to take as your examples.
6 Evolutionary Archaeology and Anthropology

In recent years there has been renewed application of Darwinian evolutionary theory to the study of cultural change. Such approaches generally explain variation in the archaeological, linguistic and ethnographic records by processes of cultural transmission, selection, adaptation, and other processes similar to those used in explanations of biological change. We will examine the structure of biological evolutionary theory, and consider the relevance of the analogy with cultural change.

Discussion questions

Are evolutionary approaches deterministic?
What is the difference between human behavioural ecology and cultural evolution? Why is culture conceived as an inheritance system?
Where does the concept of the ‘individual’ fit into evolutionary archaeologies? Why pursue an evolutionary framework in archaeology?
What is niche construction?

Essential


For further reading: evolutionary archaeology and anthropology


7  Inequality and scale in human societies

Archaeology is one strand of a broad inter-disciplinary effort to understand the evolving relationship between scale and inequality in human societies, from human origins to the present day. Research into human cognition has produced a body of theory known as ‘scalar stress’ or ‘group size’ theory, which has been explored in a range of social sciences, extending from anthropology to management theory. Such theories relate to the effect of group size on human social and political organisation, and also that of other primates. They raise fundamental questions about social evolution, which archaeologists are increasingly engaging with through their own material.

Discussion questions

What is the relationship between scale and inequality in human societies?
Have small-scale societies usually been more egalitarian than large-scale ones in human history?
Are significant levels of social equality only attainable in small groups?
Do modes of subsistence (e.g. farming), and modes of production more generally, have clear evolutionary implications for levels of social inequality?
Does living in cities necessarily require a central decision-making apparatus (e.g. an administrative hierarchy, or hierarchical forms of government)?

Essential (read at least two of the following)


Manzanilla, L.R. 2014. Cooperation and tensions in multi-ethnic corporate societies using Teotihuacan, Central Mexico, as a case study. PNAS 112 (30), 9210–9215.


For further reading


Tlaxcallan: The archaeology of an ancient republic in the New World. *Antiquity* 85 (327), 172-186.


**Essay question**

What is the relationship between scale and inequality in human societies? Discuss with reference to at least two archaeological case studies.
Religion and ritual have always been of interest in anthropology. In archaeology, asking questions about ritual seem easier to address because, by definition, the term refers to an activity with a high degree of formality—that is, repeated according to particular rules or expectations or habits. The repetitive face of ritual means that ritual activities can leave material remains. ‘Religion’ on the other hand is not even easy for us to define, let alone envision what its material correlates might be. In this seminar we will look at ritual, but more important, I will ask you to deconstruct ‘religion’ and think about the utility of the concept: whether the concept is both helpful, and not helpful, in furthering our understanding of past—and present—societies.

**Discussion questions**

- What is ‘religion’?
- What is definitive of religion that is not also part of culture? To what extent is it possible to separate religion from other aspects of past social behaviour and idea systems?
- Provide an example of ritual from your time at the Institute. What purpose(s) does the ritual serve, and what sorts of material culture are associated with your examples?

**Potential essay question**

How has the concept of ‘religion’ been helpful in explaining past behaviour through material remains? What is problematic about using ‘religion’ as explanatory, both in the past and present?

**Essential**


**For further reading:**

What exactly is ‘religion’?


Case, Shirley Jackson. 1971. *Experience with the Supernatural in Early Christian Times*. Benjamin Blom, New York. (This will get you thinking that ‘magic’ is a political term as well.


Other readings on religion and ritual


9. Identities

Identity has been a central concern in Archaeology throughout much of the history of the discipline, and remains a powerful motivation for popular interest in the past. Different approaches have emphasised different aspects of identity, from the sometimes-naïve linkage of patterns and ethnic peoples within culture-history, to processual archaeologists’ interest in rank and status, to more recent approaches to situated identities, embodiment and personhood within and beyond post-processual and interpretative archaeologies. In this seminar we will examine some of these different approaches and their continuing significance, as well as exploring the similarities and differences between categories of identity, and underlying processes of identity construction and internalisation.

Discussion questions

How have different concepts of identity shaped and been shaped by the history of archaeology?
Are their more or less challenges in reconstructing the details of different categories of identity?
Is the distinction between essentialist and constructivist approaches to identity generalizable across different sorts of identity categories?
What kinds of archaeological evidence are involved in talking about identity in the past?
To what extent are there universal processes of identification in human societies?
How should archaeologists deal with the new politics of identity emerging in Europe and the US?

Essential readings


Further reading

Social identities


27
Gardner, A. 2007. *An Archaeology of Identity: Soldiers and Society in Late Roman Britain*. (Especially Ch. 2). Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press. [INST ARCH DAA 170 GAR]


*Identities and embodiment*


Whitehouse, R. 2011. Cultural and biological approaches to the body in archaeology: can they be reconciled? In E. Cochrane and A. Gardner (eds.) Evolutionary and Interpretive Archaeologies. A dialogue, 227-44. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press. [INST ARCH AH COC]


Personhood and self-identity


Spriggs, M. 2008. Ethnographic parallels and the denial of history. World Archaeology, 40.4, 538-552. [INST ARCH Pers; <www>]


Archaeologists are increasingly recognising the importance of the social and political contexts in which archaeological interpretations have been produced in the past, and in the present. They are also increasingly recognising the claims of other groups to the material that they study, and the role of archaeological interpretations and narratives in claiming the past for particular interests. How can or should archaeologists evaluate and mediate the competing claims of multiple interested individuals and groups, with respect to the interpretation of the past?

**Discussion questions**

Why is the past important today?

Why is it so important to ask who owns the past?

Should Western museums return cultural artefacts to their countries of origin?

In what ways does consideration of the public affect the way we practice archaeology?

Does academic training give archaeologists authority in mediating alternative interpretations of the past?

Can we incorporate multiple perspectives into archaeological interpretation?

How can we evaluate alternative interpretations and claims about the past?

**Essential:**


**For further reading: archaeology, politics and the public**


Brophy, K. 2018. The Brexit Hypothesis and Prehistory and responses by other authors. Antiquity 92, 1650-1670.


Holtorf, C. 2005. From Stonehenge to Las Vegas: archaeology as popular culture. Walnut Creek: AltaMira.

Holtorf, C. 2007. Archaeology is a Brand: the meaning of archaeology in contemporary popular culture. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.


Assessment: One essay, 3,800-4,200 words

**Topic choice:** choose something that interests you and feel free to contact the Coordinator to discuss. It would be wise to have some idea by Reading Week. Students are asked to submit an outline in advance and to discuss this outline with the Coordinator. As well as the title this should provide 1) the thesis of your proposed essay, 2) a brief and general outline of the main topics to be discussed, and 3) an annotated bibliography of 5-10 articles that are central to your proposed essay. It should be 1-2 sides in length.

Due dates for outline and essay: see schedule on page 2.

**Essay Question:** It is important to have a question that you are seeking to answer, rather than a statement. All the topics covered are huge and a question will direct you to those aspects that are relevant to addressing it. You can devise your own question or develop one of the discussion questions that are given for each topic. Whichever you decide, your question must be agreed with the module coordinator. It is always a good idea to illustrate your arguments using examples or case-studies but the major focus of the essay must be the theory.

Like almost any satisfactory piece of academic writing, your essay should present an argument supported by analysis. Typically your analysis will include a critical evaluation (not simply summary or description) of concepts relevant to some subset of the theoretical literature. You need to identify and evaluate the principal or most relevant previous ideas and arguments, and develop your own reasoned argument, supporting, critiquing, or combining elements of earlier scholarship, or developing a new perspective or synthesis.

*Express your arguments in your own words;* your essay is meant to demonstrate **your understanding** of an issue. Some submitted essays are essentially just a string of quotations illustrating what others have said, but this does not demonstrate a critical assessment of those claims, or a clear understanding of the issues. Second, **do not rely on web sources.** You should be extremely cautious about relying on information from websites, and should not, normally, use them as sources for academic essays. The reliable information in them has almost invariably come from some other source, and if they are academically reputable sites, they should be properly referenced, so you can chase ideas back to their original source.

**Coursework production and submission**

General policies and procedures concerning modules and coursework, including submission procedures, assessment criteria, and general resources, are available in your Degree Handbook and on the following website: [http://wiki.ucl.ac.uk/display/archadmin](http://wiki.ucl.ac.uk/display/archadmin); see also the Appendix. It is essential that you read and comply with these. Note that some of the policies and procedures will be different depending on your status (e.g. undergraduate, postgraduate taught, affiliate, graduate diploma, intercollegiate, interdepartmental). If in doubt, please consult the Module Co-ordinator.

For this module, please **do not** use fancy fonts or, for the text, a font size less than 11 point, and use 1.5 line spacing to allow the marker space to make comments on the text. A smaller font size (8-10) and 1.0 line height may be used for the bibliography (to reduce printing costs), as long as it is still readable, and two-sided printing is welcome (to save paper and trees). Please leave at least 1 inch/2.5 cm margins to allow room for comments.

Bearing in mind that you cannot get credit for the same work twice, either in the same or different modules that are assessed as part of the same degree, you must avoid any significant overlap in your assessed work with that for other modules. If you have concerns about potential overlaps, please discuss this with the Co-ordinators of the relevant modules.
To accord with UCL regulations on anonymous marking, all coursework cover-sheets must be identified with student Candidate Numbers only, not names. This is a 5 digit alphanumeric code and can be found on Portico; it is different from the Student Number/ID. The filenames for all assessed work submitted through ‘Turnitin’, should include the student’s Candidate Number, not name as a unique identifier (e.g. YBPR6_ARCL0133_Assessment_1). Please do this, as otherwise it is difficult to match hard-copy of your essay with the Turnitin version on-line.

APPENDIX A: POLICIES AND PROCEDURES 2019-20 (PLEASE READ CAREFULLY)
This appendix provides a short précis of policies and procedures relating to modules. 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 IoA Student Administration section of Moodle: https://moodle.ucl.ac.uk/module/view
For UCL policies and procedures, see the Academic Regulations and the UCL Academic Manual: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/srs/academic-regulations ; http://www.ucl.ac.uk/academic-manual/

GENERAL MATTERS
ATTENDANCE: A register will be taken at each class. If you are unable to attend a class, please notify the lecturer by email. Students are normally required to attend at least 70% of classes.
DYSLEXIA: If you have dyslexia or any other disability, please discuss with your lecturers 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 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 Module Coordinators are not permitted to grant extensions. All requests for extensions must be submitted on a 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 Support and Wellbeing (SSW) 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 explanation, notify the Academic Administrator. When your
marked essay is returned to you, return it to the Module Co-ordinator within two weeks. You must retain a copy of all coursework submitted.

**CITING OF 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](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/current-students/guidelines/plagiarism)

**RESOURCES**

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