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POLIM0029 Theoretical Approaches in Security
Teaching Block: 1
Weeks: 1-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Owner:</th>
<th>Dr. Thomas Tyerman</th>
<th>Level:</th>
<th>M/7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Credit points:</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Prerequisites:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office:</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Curriculum area:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit owner office hours: Please see SPAIS MSc Blackboard for details
(Please note, there are no regular office hours during Reading Weeks)

Timetabled classes:

Please check your online timetable for day, time and venue of each seminar

You are also expected to attend ONE seminar each week. Your online personal timetable will inform you to which group you have been allocated. Seminar groups are fixed: you are not allowed to change seminar groups without permission from the office.

Weeks 6, 12, 18 and 24 are Reading Weeks; there is NO regular teaching in these weeks.

In addition to timetabled sessions there is a requirement for private study, reading, revision and assessments. Reading the required readings in advance of each seminar is the minimum expectation. The University Guidelines state that one credit point is broadly equivalent to 10 hours of total student input.

Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit students will:
- be able to understand and critically evaluate key debates in thinking about security as a concept;
- understand how ‘new’ security theories emerge, are advanced and contested and why;
- be able to apply knowledge to ‘key issues’ in international security; and
- be able to use knowledge acquired in the unit as a foundation for optional units in the MSc programme.

Requirements for passing the unit:
- Satisfactory attendance at seminars
- Completion of all formative work to an acceptable standard
- Attainment of a composite mark of all summative work to a passing standard (50 or above)

Details of coursework and deadlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment:</th>
<th>Word count:</th>
<th>Weighting:</th>
<th>Deadline:</th>
<th>Day:</th>
<th>Week:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formative – presentation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>To be set in class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative - essay</td>
<td>4,000 words</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9.30am 11th January 2018</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Summative essay questions will be made available on the SPAIS MSc Admin Blackboard site.
- Instructions for the submission of coursework will be emailed prior to the submission deadline.
- Assessment in the school is subject to strict penalties regarding late submission, plagiarism and maximum word count. See Appendix.
- Marking criteria can be found in the Appendix.
Unit description

This unit provides students with an understanding of international security through the examination of a series of key theoretical approaches to the concept of security. It provides an overview of the historical development of security theories, from the Cold War consensus around Realist understandings of security to the more recent deepening and broadening of security and the accompanying plurality of security theories that have emerged and the challenges that these present. It therefore provides a theoretical and conceptual foundation for the MSc in International Security.

Objectives

This unit aims to provide students with a theoretical understanding of security issues and debates. The principal aim of the unit is to equip students to understand and analyse security challenges from different theoretical perspectives and assess the core assumptions as well as advantages and disadvantages of these approaches. For each theoretical approach we will ask the central questions: What is security? Who is the object and/or subject of security? Who is the agent of security? How is security achieved? Where is security done? The unit will therefore develop the student’s interest in and knowledge and understanding of the role of security theories at different ‘scales’ – from international to national to human to everyday to global – and how new theories emerge out of debate, as well as in response to key events and sociological and political changes. Students will therefore develop an understanding of how security theories are political and apply this understanding to interpreting security issues and events.

Learning outcomes

At the end of this unit students will:

- be able to understand and critically evaluate key debates in thinking about security as a concept;
- understand how ‘new’ security theories emerge, are advanced and contested and why;
- be able to apply knowledge to ‘key issues’ in international security; and
- be able to use knowledge acquired in the unit as a foundation for optional units in the MSc programme.
Teaching arrangements

There are ten seminars in the unit (Weeks 1-5 and 7-11). Attendance is required. Weeks 6 and 12 are Reading Weeks; there is no regular teaching in these weeks. Students may also come to an office hour to discuss advice on presentations and essays. Office hours are held once a week, as posted.

Requirements for credit points

For credit points to be awarded for this unit, you must complete all required work (two 5-minute presentations and an essay) to at least a passing standard (a mark of 50) and have no more than two non-excused seminar absences.

1. Seminar Presentations

Each student is required to make two (2) oral seminar presentations as part of a group set of presentations. The first presentation will take place in weeks 2-5, the second in weeks 7-10. The guidelines are as follows:

- The topics will be allocated in the first seminar
- Each presentation is to be of 5 minutes in length. As with the word limit on the essay, it is important to be concise.
- The presentation should not be read out word for word, but must be presented from notes and with an awareness of the structure and ‘rules’ for how to communicate effectively to an audience.
- It must address the topic set for that week and revolve around understandings of security theory. Additional information on the content of the presentations will be discussed in Week 1.
- A hand-out must be prepared and circulated which is to include a brief bibliography.
- The hand-out must be word-processed, and be no longer than one side of A4 paper. I will photocopy the handout for all seminar members if you send it me by 5 pm on the day BEFORE your seminar (or you must prepare and bring enough copies).
- There will be 5 minutes for you to answer questions from the seminar group.
- If requested, I will provide verbal and informal feedback on your presentation after seminar. When you are preparing for your presentation, focus on the importance of quality of handout, presentation style (pace, volume and time management), presentations content and contribution to the entire seminar.

The mark for the presentation does not count towards the final unit mark, but will provide guidance on areas to improve for the final essay such as structure or strength of evidence and argument.

2. Summative assessment: Essay (100% of the final mark)

The final grade for the course will be based on the following: FINAL PAPER (4,000 words in length).

The essay for this unit is a summative essay, that is, it decides the final mark for this unit. In contrast, the presentation is formative, that is, it does not count towards the final mark for the unit but instead is aimed at, among other things, assisting you in preparing for the summative assessment. The essay and the oral seminar presentation must be on different topics. Essay questions will be distributed early in term.

Full details about all requirements and rules regarding essays – including formatting, submission, pass marks, extensions, feedback, resubmissions, and so on – are in the Departmental Graduate Studies handbook which is online at http://www.bris.ac.uk/politics/current-pg/contents.html.

You can access the Blackboard site via this URL: https://www.ole.bris.ac.uk/webapps/login/ by using your University login and password. The Graduate Studies Administrator will circulate detailed information on how to submit your work before each hand-in date. Only electronic submission is accepted.
Transferable skills

During this unit you will develop your transferable skills in group work, presenting to groups and writing.

Development and feedback

You will receive written feedback on all of these aspects of your work with a view to assisting you in developing your abilities in these areas. The feedback on your essay will be returned to you via the Graduate Studies Coordinator.

Seminar schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unit introduction: pictures of security: theory, practice, politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Security, violence, and peace: peace studies and pacifism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cold War realism and liberalism: security as deterrence vs cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Post-Cold War security I: broadening the agenda and securitisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Post-Cold War security II: human security and security as emancipation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Critical approaches: poststructuralism, identity, and (in)security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Feminism: security as gendered, embodied, everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Postcolonialism: security as eurocentrism, racism, and imperialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>International Political Sociology: security as risk, governance, technology, assemblage, and biopolitics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Security theories review and conclusions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core reading

Each week’s seminar will proceed on the assumption that you have completed all of that week’s Essential reading. The Essential reading has been designed to ensure that it is all read. You are also encouraged to read more from the Recommended Reading list, but also in connection with your own questions and curiosity.

Suggested books for additional background reading

A number of textbooks on security theories have been published over the years and you may find it useful to consult one or two of these when you find a particular theory more challenging, when you are preparing your presentations or your essay. The following textbooks are the most highly recommended, frequently used and a number of copies are held in the university library:


Electronic Journals

In addition to hard copy journals, the library subscribes to a vast number of electronic journals. Most of the following are not in the library in hard copy. Where the journal is electronic only, no library shelfmark is (or indeed can) be given in the syllabus below. The most relevant journals for this unit are *Security Dialogue*,

There is also lots of value in more specialised and regionally specific journals. Please feel free to investigate these journals and their articles. Where in doubt on the appropriateness of a source, please email me or speak to the subject librarian at the Arts and Social Sciences library.

Electronic journals are accessible through the library’s home page at http://www.bris.ac.uk/is/library.

It is a good idea to supplement and update the assigned material by reading current newspapers/periodicals. Browsing through the contents pages of these journals is a great way of finding unexpected valuable angles on issues.

A growing number of sources are available on the web and some and some are listed in this syllabus. As with all sources you should treat items posted on the web critically and you should not rely solely on sources taken from the Internet when preparing for seminar presentations and writing essays

BEWARE WIKIPEDIA!

Wikipedia comes high in online searches. However, entries vary drastically in their reliability and hence you should not rely on it for facts or interpretations. It has come to light that corporations, government bodies and many others have been editing entries anonymously. See – and search - for yourself at http://wikiscanner.virgil.gr/ . DO NOT USE Wikipedia for citation.
Week 1: UNIT INTRODUCTION: Pictures of security: theory, practice, politics

This first week we introduce the content of the unit, and go over the presentation schedule, content and format. We discuss the best way to prepare for seminars, and begin our conversation on security, security theory and the politics of thinking through theory.

Key concept: theory/practice; pictures of international politics and security; (referent) objects and subjects of security; actors of security;

Key questions: How have understandings of the concept of security changed over the decades? Why are security theories important? To what extent are security theories political? Do more theories mean better theories and therefore more security, or are more theories a hindrance? How are theories related to political practice?

Essential readings


Exercise: Using the Implosion

DO: Identify an object and using DUMIT for inspiration ‘implode’ its security dimensions. Be prepared to discuss your object, the exercise, and what you found in class.

Recommended readings:

**Week 2: Security, violence, and peace: peace studies and pacifism**

**Key concepts:** physical versus structural violence; pacifism; peace studies

**Key questions:** What are the multiple meanings of the security? Is violence just a synonym for insecurity? What do accounts of violence tell us about security and security theory? What do theories of non-violence, pacifism and peace tell us about security and security theory? Is there a role for pacifism in global politics?

**Essential readings:**

**Exercise: Critical Reading**
For each Essential reading, identify key definitions, the core argument, and a question for further discussion. Do you agree with the definitions? Do you agree with the core argument? Do these authors agree amongst themselves? Do they disagree?

**Recommended readings:**
**Week 3: Cold War realism and liberalism: security as deterrence vs cooperation**

**Key concepts:** national security; classical/structural/neoréalism; anarchy; competition; offensive vs defensive realism; nuclear deterrence; security dilemma; balance of power; liberal internationalism; institutionalism; interdependence; neoliberalism; collective security; republican security theory; democratic peace; global governance; cosmopolitanism

**Key questions:** What different pictures of the world do realism and liberalism offer? What are the underlying assumptions about the world and security actors? Do they share any theoretical commitments? Who or what is being secured and how? Are these theories pessimistic or optimistic about security? What is the role of the nation state? Does it matter who makes theory? Can/should we strive towards scientific objectivity when theorizing security?

**Essential readings:**

**Exercise: Comparing pictures of international relations and security**
Based on this week’s readings, create a list of definitions of key realist and liberal security terms. Complete a version of the accompanying table to compare and contrast the core assumptions of realist security theories with liberal security theories. Be prepared to discuss the table in seminar. We will revisit this table, and the questions it asks us to think through, in later weeks.

| SECURITY THEORY | | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Key Author      | |
| **ONTOLOGY**    | Structure comes from... and matters because... |
| The referent object of security is... | |
| The most important actors are... | |
| Power comes from... | |
| (in)security comes from...and security is achieved by... | |
| **EPISTEMOLOGY** | i.e. what is their account of the nature of knowledge and truth? Where does it come from? |
| METHOD | Based on the ontology and epistemology, what methods are suggested for the study and practice of security? |
| ETHICS AND POLITICS | |
| **SCALE(S)** | |
Recommended readings:
Week 4: Post-Cold War security I: broadening the agenda and securitisation

**Key concepts:** Speech acts; Securitisation Theory; securitisation and desecuritisation; politicisation; social construction; constructivism; state-centrism; security sectors; broadening and deepening; new security threats;

**Key questions:** How has the analysis of security ‘broadened and deepened’ since the Cold War? What is at stake in this broadening and deepening of the security agenda? How are issues ‘securitised’? Is everything open to securitisation? What are the consequences of securitization and should we aim to desecuritise? What is the role of the securitisation theorist? Is it a conservative theory?

**Essential reading:**

**Exercise: UK National Security Strategy 2010**
Prepare answers for the following questions and bring along to the seminar for discussion:
1) What security threats are identified in the NSS?
2) What is the referent object of security and who are they key actors?
3) To what extent does the NSS offer a broadened and/or deepened understanding of security?
4) How have issues been securitised here? Are there any problems with how this has happened?

**Recommended readings**
**Week 5: Post-Cold War security II: human security and security as emancipation**

**Key concepts:** Critical Theory; Marxism; Critical Security Studies (Welsh School); radicalism and revolution; capitalism, the state, and war; emancipation; human security; policy-relevance and problem-solving theory vs radical critique and revolution.

**Key questions:** How do Human Security and Critical Security Studies ‘broaden’ and/or ‘deepen’ the concept of security? What are the key issues for Human Security and Critical Security Studies? How are they different (think ontology, epistemology, methodology)? Who/what needs securing? How is security to be achieved? What is at stake politically in the debate over ‘policy-relevance’? How should theory inform security practice? Does security require revolution?

**Essential Reading:**

**Exercise: Radicalism and emancipation**

**Angela Davis**
Watch this short extract from an interview with Angela Davis on violence and revolution: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2HnDONDvJVE](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2HnDONDvJVE) How does Davis offer an understanding of violence as structural? What would security as emancipation look like here?

**Slavoj Zizek**
Watch an extract from Salvoj Zizek and Sophie Fiennes’ (2012) *A Pervert’s Guide to Ideology*, ‘What is Ideology?’, available at: [https://youtu.be/5Ch5ZCGi0PQ](https://youtu.be/5Ch5ZCGi0PQ) How does Zizek understand ideology and by extension insecurity? How is security as emancipation produced?

**Recommended readings**


Week 6: READING WEEK (no teaching)
Week 7: Critical approaches: poststructuralism, identity, and (in)security

Key concepts: (in)security; discourse; subjectivities (as opposed to identities); logocentrism; truth regimes; power/knowledge; performativity; subjectivity and identity; statecraft; biopolitics; governmentality; inside/outside; exclusion; excess; uncertainty; deconstruction; genealogy; resistance

Key questions: How are security and insecurity constructed together? Does this make it any less ‘real’? How is security framed/written in international politics, and who is missing from these frames? How are power, subjectivity, and discourse related? How do states ‘perform’ security? How is representation political?

Essential reading:

1. Exercise: Discourse Analysis: Getting Started with binary pairs
   2. Using the text of the speech delivered by President George W. Bush on September 20, 2001 to the Joint Session of Congress, conduct an analysis of the binary pairs presented in the speech. Who is the ‘us’ and how are ‘we’ constructed? Who is ‘the Other’ and how are ‘they’ constructed? What is the excluded?

4. What were the policies and legacies of the Global War on Terror as a result of this construction? How have we (Anglo-Americans) been asked to ‘govern’ ourselves? What is the in/security produced? What is the excess?

Alternative Exercise: Visual Analysis: Getting Started with content analysis

On of the key dimensions of post-structural approaches is that discourse is also constituted through the visual and material, and the practices that bring language, material and visual into being (language s also visual and material for example). In/security is a result of these discursive practices. To understand how the visual makes security meaning, try reading one or both of the following ‘iconic’ images for their content (as opposed to the practices that produce the images, their circulation, or their reading by audiences). What can you see and what might it mean? What (visual) histories do these images reflect? Who are the subjects in these images and how are they constructed and juxtaposed visually? Who is the ‘we’? Who is ‘the Other’? What is the excluded? Is there in/security in reproducing these images?
Recommended readings


**Week 8: Feminism: security as gendered, embodied, everyday**

**Key concepts:** liberal and radical feminist security theories; gender; practice; embodiment; affect; intersectionality; marginalisation; everyday life; patriarchy; male-centrism; gender mainstreaming; militarisation and masculinity; feminisation of labour and private/public dichotomy

**Key questions:** What key questions do feminist analyses of international security ask and what are some of the key security issues they look at? How do feminist analyses of gender, the everyday, and marginalisation challenge ‘mainstream’ understandings of international politics and security? Can we just ‘add women and stir’?

**Essential reading:**
3. hooks, b. (1990) ‘Chapter 15: Choosing the margin as a space of radical openness’ *Yearning: race, gender, and cultural politics* [Boston; South End Press]: 145-153

**Exercise 1: One feminism or many?**
Drawing on the readings, produce a list of different feminist approaches to security, identifying what they see as (i) the object of security (ii) the cause(s) of insecurity and how insecurity manifests, and (iii) the way to achieve security.

**Exercise 2: Sexual violence and security**
Drawing on the readings for this week, watch the two video clips below and prepare answers to the following questions ready for discussion in the seminar:
1) How is sexual violence represented as a security issue?
2) Where is sexual violence seen as taking place?
3) Who are presumed to be the victims/perpetrators?
4) What response is suggested?
5) Is there anything problematic about these representations of gender and security?

‘Soldiers for Women’
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b4aiso6pvRE

‘Stop Rape Now’
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=woW1_xT0gq8

**Recommended readings**
Peterson, V. Spike (1999) Gendered states: feminist (re)visions of international relations theory [Boulder: Lynne Rienner]
Stern, M. & Wibben, A. (eds.) 2014. ‘A decade of feminist security studies revisited’ (all the articles are highly recommended): http://sdi.sagepub.com/site/Virtualspecialissues/GenderStudies.xhtml
Week 9: Postcolonialism: security as eurocentrism, racism, and imperialism

Key concepts: Eurocentrism/Western-centrism; colonialism/neo-colonialism; decolonisation; North-South relations; core-periphery; history; geography; humanitarian intervention; responsibility to protect doctrine; development; ‘good governance’ and ‘failed states’; liberal imperialism; race; racism.

Key questions: How is the study and practice of security western-centric? Is the history of colonialism still relevant today? Is contemporary security post- or neo-colonial? Is liberal intervention a modern form of imperialism? How are narratives of international security racialised?

Essential reading:

Exercise: Humanitarianism, intervention, and imperialism
Do some research online on an example of a post-Cold War humanitarian intervention (e.g. Libya, Syria, Rwanda, Congo, Kosovo). Have a look at UN, NATO, and NGO websites, newspaper reports, etc.

Think about the following questions and prepare for a discussion in the seminar:
1) What does ‘humanitarian’ mean? Is it a ‘western-centric’ concept?
2) How was intervention justified and carried out? By whom?
3) Does humanitarian intervention increase security? For whom? Who is left out?
4) In what ways, if any, did the narratives and practices of the intervention reflect histories of colonialism and racism?

Recommended readings
Fanon (2001) The Wretched of the Earth (trans. Constance Farrington) [London; Penguin]


---

Week 10: International Political Sociology: security as risk, governance, technology, assemblage, and biopolitics

Key concepts: practice; dispositive; assemblage; global; technology; surveillance; species life; sovereignty; biopolitics; statecraft

Key questions: What is a security assemblage or dispositif? What does this approach tell us about who the actors are in security? Where agency lies? On what scale do ‘security as assemblage’ and ‘security as in/security’ theories operate? Where does security take place?

Essential Reading:

** See also https://christopherjmiles.com/2016/10/17/drone-reading-list/ for a detailed list of critical readings on drones technology and warfare.

Exercise: Practicing the art of synthesis
Synthesize a review of the Essential readings into a single paragraph with an argument (underline your argument statement) and be prepared to circulate this and discuss within the group.

Recommended readings


Week 11: Security theories review and conclusions

This week is a review week, allowing us to revisit key ideas and theories that need or deserve a second glance as determined by the group. For example, as agreed in week 10, we can set a reading or idea that we collectively return to, or divide into groups to revisit different readings or ideas.

We may also agree to share sample introductions or sample pieces of writing (no more than a single page per person or by prior agreement) amongst ourselves for discussion and comment in order to move forward our essay planning.

During the course of the seminar, you may also be asked to complete a key concepts grid, reviewing the unit through a compare and contrast exercise that spans all weeks.

Good luck with your essays!
Appendix A

Instructions on how to submit essays electronically

1. Log in to Blackboard (https://www.ole.bris.ac.uk/) and select the Blackboard course for the unit you are submitting work for. If you cannot see it, please e-mail f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk with your username and ask to be added.

2. Click on the "Submit Work Here" option on the left hand menu and then find the correct assessment from the list.

3. Select ‘view/complete’ for the appropriate piece of work. It is your responsibility to ensure that you have selected both the correct unit and the correct piece of work.

4. The screen will display ‘single file upload’ and your name. Enter your candidate number as a submission title, and then select the file that you wish to upload by clicking the ‘browse’ button. Click on the ‘upload’ button at the bottom.

5. You will then be shown the essay to be submitted. Check that you have selected the correct essay and click the ‘Submit’ button. This step must be completed or the submission is not complete.

6. You will be informed of a successful submission. A digital receipt is displayed on screen and a copy sent to your email address for your records.

Important notes

- You are only allowed to submit one file to Blackboard (single file upload), so ensure that all parts of your work – references, bibliography etc. – are included in one single document and that you upload the correct version. You will not be able to change the file once you have uploaded.

- Blackboard will accept a variety of file formats, but the School can only accept work submitted in .rtf (Rich Text Format) or .doc/.docx (Word Document) format. If you use another word processing package, please ensure you save in a compatible format.

- By submitting your essay, you are confirming that you have read the regulations on plagiarism and confirm that the submission is not plagiarised. You also confirm that the word count stated on the essay is an accurate statement of essay length.

- If Blackboard is not working email your assessment to f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk with the unit code and title in the subject line.

How to confirm that your essay has been submitted

You will have received a digital receipt by email and if you click on the assessment again (steps 1-4), you will see the title and submission date of the essay you have submitted. If you click on submit, you will not be able to submit again. This table also displays the date of submission. If you click on the title of the essay, it will open in a new window and you can also see what time the essay was submitted.
Appendix B

Summary of Relevant School Regulations
(Further details are in the Postgraduate taught handbook, which takes precedence)

Attendance of Seminars
SPAIS takes attendance of and participation in seminars very seriously. Seminars form an essential part of your learning and you need to make sure you arrive on time, have done the required reading and participate fully. Attendance at all seminars is monitored, with absence only condoned in cases of illness or for other exceptional reasons. If you are unable to attend a seminar you must inform your seminar tutor. You should also provide evidence to explain your absence, such as a self-certification and/or medical note, counselling letter or other official document. If you are ill or are experiencing some other kind of difficulty which is preventing you from attending seminars for a prolonged period, please contact the Postgraduate Office or the Graduate Administration Manager who can advise on how to proceed.

Requirements for credit points
To be awarded credit points for a taught unit, students must:

- Have a satisfactory attendance record.
- Pass the summative assessment

Where there are multiple summative assessments in a unit, students must achieve the pass mark for the weighted average of the assessments (i.e. in the mark for the unit overall). They do not need to pass each individual piece of assessment. If any of these conditions are not met, then your ability to progress through your degree may be affected.

Presentation of written work
Coursework must be word-processed. As a guide, use a clear, easy-to-read font such as Arial or Times New Roman, in at least 11pt. You may double-space or single-space your essays as you prefer. Your tutor will let you know if they have a preference. All pages should be numbered. Ensure that the essay question appears on the first page.

Students are required to complete and include a cover page for essay/summative submissions – the template cover page will be available via the online submission point for students to complete.

Candidate numbers are required on summative work in order to ensure that marking is anonymous. Note that your candidate number is not the same as your student number. This number can be viewed in StudentInfo (https://www.bris.ac.uk/studentinfo). You should regard this number as personal to you and not share it with anyone else. The number is used to ensure that the marking of a student’s work is done anonymously. Please ensure that you memorise your candidate number as you will need to write it on every assessment.

Assessment Length
Each piece of coursework must not exceed the stipulated maximum length for the assignment (the ‘word count’) listed in the unit guide. Summative work that exceeds the maximum length will be subject to penalties. The word count is absolute (there is no 10% leeway, as commonly rumoured). Five marks will be deducted for every 100 words or part thereof over the word limit. Thus, an essay that is 1 word over the word
limit will be penalised 5 marks; an essay that is 101 words over the word limit will be penalised 10 marks, and so on.

The word count includes all text, tables, numbers, footnotes/endnotes, Harvard referencing in the body of the text and direct quotes. It excludes the cover page, bibliography, headers and appendices. However, appendices should only be used for reproducing documents, not additional text written by you.

Students are advised that any attempt to circumvent word count limits by changing essay format, e.g. by removing spaces in references, will be investigated. In these cases, penalties will be applied if the actual word count is exceeded and further disciplinary action may be taken.

Students should be aware that word count penalties will incur a mark reduction that may in turn impact their progress and/or overall qualification.

Referencing and Plagiarism
Students are required to reference the source materials used to inform their submitted work. Students are expected to use the Harvard referencing system as set out in the relevant section of the SPAIS Study Guide. Unless otherwise stated, essays must contain a bibliography. Students should consult the SPAIS Study Guide for full details (students can access this via the SPAIS MSc-Dip Admin Blackboard site).

Inadequate referencing in submitted work can run the risk of plagiarism. Plagiarism is the unacknowledged inclusion in a student’s work of material derived from the published or unpublished work of another. This constitutes plagiarism whether it is intentional or unintentional. “Work” includes internet sources as well as printed material.

Plagiarism is a serious academic offence and penalties will be applied in such cases, as is set out in the SPAIS Postgraduate taught handbook. See also the relevant section of the School Study Skills Guide for more information.

Please note that plagiarism may lead to penalties that may prevent students found guilty of such an offence from progressing in their programme of study.

Extensions
Extensions to coursework deadlines will only be granted in exceptional circumstances. If you want to request an extension, complete a Coursework Extension Request Form (available at Blackboard/SPAIS MSC/Dip Administration/forms) and submit the form with your evidence (e.g. medical certificate, death certificate, or hospital letter) to Faye Cooper in the Postgraduate Office, 11 Priory Road or f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk.

Extension requests will not be considered if there is no supporting evidence.
All extension requests should be submitted at least 72 hours prior to the assessment deadline. If the circumstance occurs after this point, then please either telephone or see the Graduate Administration Manager in person. In their absence you can contact Faye Cooper in the PG Office, again in person or by telephone.

Extensions can only be granted by the Graduate Administration Office. They cannot be granted by unit convenors or seminar tutors.

You will receive an email to confirm whether your extension request has been granted or not.

**Submitting Essays/Work for assessment**
Formative work: Where applicable, details on how to submit formative work for assessment will be contained in this unit guide.

Summative work: All summative submissions *must be submitted electronically via Blackboard.*

Electronic copies enable an efficient system of receipting, providing the student and the School with a record of exactly when an essay was submitted. It also enables the School to systematically check the length of submitted essays and to safeguard against plagiarism.

**Late Submissions**
Penalties are imposed for work submitted late without an approved extension. Any kind of computer/electronic failure is *not* accepted as a valid reason for an extension, so make sure you back up your work on another computer, memory stick or in the cloud (e.g. One Drive, Dropbox or another equivalent system). Also ensure that the clock on your computer is correct. The following schema of marks deduction for late/non-submission is applied to both formative work and summative work:

- Up to 24 hours late, or part thereof *Penalty of 10 marks*
- For each additional 24 hours late, or part thereof *A further 5 marks deduction for each 24 hours, or part thereof*
- Assessment submitted over one week late *Treated as a non-submission: fail and mark of zero recorded. This will be noted on your transcript.*

- The 24 hour period runs from the deadline for submission, and includes Saturdays, Sundays, bank holidays and university closure days.
- If an essay submitted less than one week late fails solely due to the imposition of a late penalty, then the mark will be capped at 50 and recorded as a second attempt.

*Students should be aware that late penalties will incur a mark reduction that may in turn impact their progress and/or overall qualification.*

**Marks and Feedback**
In addition to an overall mark, students will receive written feedback on their assessed work.

In accordance with the Faculty’s Regulations and Code of Practice for Taught programmes, marks and feedback are typically returned within fifteen working days of the relevant submission deadline, unless exceptional circumstances arise in which case
students will be informed of the deadline for return. The process of marking and providing detailed feedback is a labour-intensive one, with most 4000 word essays taking at least 45 minutes to assess and comment upon. Summative work also needs to be checked for plagiarism and length and moderated by a second member of staff to ensure marking is fair and consistent.

If work is submitted late, then it may not be possible to return feedback within fifteen working days.

**Fails and Resits**
If you fail the unit overall, you will normally be required to resubmit or resit unless you do not meet the progression requirements for your programme. Your School Office will contact you if this is the case.
Appendix C

Level 7 Marking and Assessment Criteria (Postgraduate)
All MSc/Diploma marking in the School is out of 100 on the following scale and with the following classifications:

70 and above Distinction
60-69 Merit
50-59 Pass
Below 50 Fail

Work within each of the classifications is expected to demonstrate the following attributes. Please note that markers do not weight each of these attributes equally when finalising the mark. Markers may also take into account the extent to which achievement of unit-specific intended learning outcomes (see unit guide) has been demonstrated when assessing work and arriving at the mark.

70-100: DISTINCTION
Addresses the Question Set
The work is a highly appropriate response to the question or assignment task that has been set. Coverage and selection of content is exemplary. There is clear analysis of the question or topic. Clear ability to analyse and synthesise ideas is demonstrated. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), work will be outstanding in (where appropriate) its incorporation and use of empirical evidence/theoretical frameworks/methodological approaches in addressing the question.

Contains coherent structure and argument
The assignment is internally consistent, extremely coherent, concise and well-structured. The introduction is well focused and provides a clear indication of the rationale, key literature base used and organisation of the work. The central argument/structure of the work has a clear and logical sequence of progression. The conclusion draws insights which are logically developed from the analysis. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), work will be outstanding in the extent to which the structure facilitates the answer to the question.

Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data
A detailed understanding of key concepts and/or data will be demonstrated. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+) sustained evidence of critical understanding of concepts and/or critical analysis of data will be demonstrated.

Supports argument with appropriate evidence
The assignment demonstrates that an excellent knowledge of the topic has been gained from careful research and wide ranging reading that goes well beyond the prescribed reading list. The selection, interpretation, comparison, evaluation, and integration of evidence and source material to support the argument is extremely effective. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), work will indicate outstanding ability to deal with complexity, contradictions or gaps in the existing academic literature.

Demonstrates critical evaluation
Work at this level will indicate a detailed and critical understanding of central theoretical and/or methodological issues as appropriate. At the upper end of the distinction range
(marks of 80+) work will show extensive evidence of coherence, creativity, originality and imagination in addressing the question or topic.

**Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format**
The work is extremely well presented, with minimal grammatical or spelling errors. It is written in a fluent and engaging style that demonstrates sufficient background reading, with exemplary referencing and bibliographic formatting in accordance with the required conventions. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), the work will be virtually error-free in these respects.

**60-69: MERIT**

*Addresses the Question Set*
The work is a very appropriate response to the set question or assignment task. The question is addressed comprehensively, and a convincing and coherent argument is maintained in doing so. There is very good coverage of content and some evidence of an ability to think critically in relation to the question or topic will be shown. Where appropriate, the work will illustrate good comprehension of the theoretical implications of the set question or assignment.

*Contains coherent structure and argument*
The structure of the assignment is sound. The introduction is relevant and provides the reader with a clear guide to the central argument and the overall structure of the work. The conclusion will highlight and reflect upon the key points of argument developed within the main body of the essay and relative to the set question or assignment.

* Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data*
A sound understanding of relevant key concepts and/or date has been developed and demonstrated, with key related issues and debates identified and discussed.

*Supports argument with appropriate evidence*
Overall there is a very good selection and use of sources which are well integrated, interpreted and evaluated. The work will demonstrate the ability to be selective in the range of material used. Some independent reading and research that goes beyond the prescribed reading list will be demonstrated, although the range of evidence used will be more restricted in comparison with an assignment awarded a higher grade.

*Demonstrates critical evaluation*
The work will clearly demonstrate a capacity to synthesise and critically evaluate source materials and/or debates in relation to the set question or assignment rather than simply describe or summarise them.

**Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format**
The work is clear and fluent and largely conforms to referencing and bibliographic conventions. It has been well edited and demonstrates sufficient background reading. Proof-reading has resulted in there being few grammatical or spelling errors.

**50-59: PASS**

*Addresses the Question Set*
The work is a reasonably appropriate response to the set question or assignment task. All aspects of the set question or topic have been addressed. The work will show some
comprehension of the underlying theoretical/methodological implications of the question where appropriate, but there may be limitations in the understanding of how these issues relate to the question.

Contains coherent structure and argument
The assignment has been effectively structured, although more careful editing may have improved the overall coherence of argument. The introduction is well focused and provides a sense of the central argument and overall organisation. The conclusion provides a summary of the discussion, although may be primarily descriptive in nature and may fail to reflect upon or support the argument fully.

Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data
A basic level of understanding of relevant key concepts and/or data has been demonstrated, though there may be some errors and/or gaps in the knowledge and understanding. Key related issues have been identified and discussed but without many significant insights being developed.

Supports argument with appropriate evidence
The argument will be supported by reference to and incorporation of some relevant evidence, but with scope for greater range and depth of evidence. The work will indicate a generally clear understanding of appropriate evidence, but this may be presented in an uncritical/descriptive manner and/or insufficiently incorporated into the overall argument in response to the set question or assignment task.

Demonstrates critical evaluation
A good range of relevant content has been covered, and there is some attempt at analysis but a tendency to be descriptive rather than critical. Work in this classification may also exhibit a tendency to assert/state points of argument rather than argue on the basis of reasoning and evidence.

Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format
The style of writing is appropriate and presents few comprehension difficulties for the reader. The assignment is not as fluently written as it might have been, and there may be scope for improvement in spelling and grammar. There is evidence of sufficient background reading. Referencing and bibliographic formatting generally conform to the conventions, but there may be scope for further improvement in accuracy and consistency in accordance with the required conventions.

0-49 FAIL
Addresses the Question Set
Although some attempt will have been made, the work largely fails to address and/or significantly misunderstands the set question or assignment task. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) there is little or no understanding of the set question or assignment task in evidence.

Contains coherent structure and argument
The work does not contain a sufficiently structured argument, and may be ineffectively organised. The introduction may lack a clear rationale or statement of argument, and/or may lack a clear outline of the overall structure of the assignment. The conclusion may lack any indication of insights in relation to the set question or assignment task. At the
lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) the structure of the work may be incoherent or illogical, and/or the work may lack a clearly developed argument.

**Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data**
There is limited knowledge and understanding of key concepts and/or data, with significant errors and/or omissions in this respect. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) there may be significant lack of awareness or understanding of key concepts and/or data.

**Supports argument with appropriate evidence**
Few key points of appropriate evidence are identified and/or there may be very little attempt at analysis of evidence, with the work tending towards excessive description. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) evidence referred to and included in the work may not be relevant to the addressing the set question or assignment task.

**Demonstrates critical evaluation**
The approach is typified by a general lack of critical evaluation in relation to relevant literature and issues. Work that simply asserts rather than argues a case may also fall into this classification. The use of sources may be excessively derivative of existing work, with little or no indication of an ability to independently analyse relevant material. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) there is little or no evidence of critical evaluation.

**Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format**
The standard of writing presents difficulties for the reader, with frequent grammatical and spelling errors to a degree that inhibits communication. The range and depth of background reading may be insufficient. The approach to referencing and bibliographic formatting does not follow the required conventions to a sufficiently consistent level. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) the use of language may present considerable comprehension difficulties for the reader. The assignment may not meet stipulations in terms of layout and/or length, and the approach to referencing may not meet expected conventions.