SOCIM3107 Theories of Ethnicity and Racism

Teaching Block: 1  
Weeks: 1-12

Unit Owner:  Dr Jon Fox  
Level: M/7

Phone: 0117 331 0608  
Credit points: 20

Email: jon.fox@bristol.ac.uk  
Prerequisites: None

Office: 2.02, 3 Priory Road  
Curriculum area: Unit owner

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

Seminar time and location:  
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

• argue for a preference for one definition of ethnicity as against competing definitions;
• argue similarly for preferred definitions of racism;
• demonstrate a critical knowledge of key theories of racism and ethnicity, drawing from key works in social theory;
• develop a view of modernity into which theories of ethnicity and racism may be fitted;
• have a clear understanding of the debates about citizenship, multiculturalism and assimilation/integration; and,
• understand the intersections of class, social inequalities and ethnicity.

Requirements for passing the unit:

• Satisfactory attendance at seminars
• Completion of all formative work to an acceptable standard
• Combined mark of all summative work must be a pass (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 - essay</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11.00am 10th November</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative - essay</td>
<td>4,000 words</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9.30am 11th January</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Assessment Week 1</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.
Teaching Format, Unit Expectations, Award of Credit Points

Unit aims
This unit will examine key theoretical orientations to the concepts of racism and ethnicity. The course will critically assess the ways in which these concepts are used and will explore competing explanatory frameworks.

Unit Objectives
- to examine critically the key theoretical debates concerning racism and ethnicity; and,
- to link understandings of ethnicity and racism to theories of social change and modernity.

Each weekly session is up to two hours long, structured combining seminar discussion around key themes as identified and introduced by the tutor. These discussions will be based on the reading for each week. **All students must do the required reading set for each session.**

For the award of credit points, students must attend all sessions, make considered presentations, and complete the assessed essay. Credit points are necessary for students to be recognised as having successfully completed the unit.

Presentations
Each student will give one 10 minute presentation. Students will sign-up for presentations for a week of their choosing. Presentations should critically address the week’s main substantive themes.

Coursework essay
Students may submit a short (1,500 word) essay. This is not required but it provides an opportunity for students to get guidance from the tutor on their work.

Assessed essay – 4,000-word essay due at the completion of the unit.

Set Readings, ‘Study Skills’ and Library
A selection of recommended readings constitutes the minimum requirement for each session. In order for students to grasp fully the debates addressed, a list of further reading is provided for each session which students will be expected to pursue in accordance with their interests.

The following more general works may be of benefit but should not be relied upon exclusively. These include:

Modood, T. 2007 *Multiculturalism, a Civic Idea*, Polity HM1271 MOD

Students must also read widely in academic journals: the principal ones are:

*Ethnicities*  
*Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*  
*Nations and Nationalism*  
*International Migration Review*

*Ethnic and Racial Studies*  
*Patterns of Prejudice*  
*Social Identities*
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Introduction

Week 1: The social construction of race and ethnicity

This week we establish the theoretical foundations for the study of race and ethnicity. Our goal is to establish that race and ethnicity are social constructs. In so doing, we do not seek to diminish the significance of race and ethnicity but rather to understand them as social (as opposed natural) phenomena that are related to other social processes in the world. This perspective informs all subsequent analysis in the weeks to come.

Recommended reading:

Loïc Wacquant, ‘For an analytic of racial domination’, Political Power and Social Theory, vol. 11 (1997), pp. 221-34. JA1.P49

Further reading:

Week 2:  The history of race

In week two, we examine the historical origins of race. We look into the emergence of race in the context of colonialism, slavery, and migration. Race in this view is a modern phenomenon; it has not been around since time immemorial nor will it be around forever, but rather must be understood in relation to specific and changing historical conditions. This is the social constructivist position in historical perspective.

Recommended reading:


Further reading:


Week 3:  The history of ethnicity

Following from race, we turn our attention this week to ethnicity. Ethnicity is presented as a predominantly 20th century social phenomenon that enters into circulation in the context of international migration. Ethnicity, it is argued, is the language we use to make sense of the social difference that is the aftermath of migration. We study this nexus of ethnicity and migration in different geographical and historical contexts.

Recommended reading:


Chapter 2: Race, Ethnicity, and Culture

Week 4: Culture as Cognition

In the fourth and fifth weeks of the unit, our investigation shifts to the cultural dimensions of race and ethnicity. Here, we are interested in race and ethnicity as categories of social division that can be situationally invoked to parse the social world. The meaning and content of these categories are the focus of struggle between differently situated actors invested in defining race and ethnicity. Race and ethnicity in this perspective are relational concepts that give meaning to us and our place in the world.

Recommended reading:


Pierre Bourdieu, ‘The social space and the genesis of groups’, *Theory and Society*, vol. 14, no. 6 (1985), pp. 723-44. H1 T49

Rogers Brubaker, Mara Loveman, and Peter Stamatov, ‘Ethnicity as cognition’, *Theory and Society*, vol. 33, no. 1 (2004), pp. 31-64. H1 T49


Further reading:


Week 5: Culture as structure

We continue our focus on the cultural dimensions and determinants of race and ethnicity by considering its structural elements. This week we investigate culture as a larger system of meaning in which ideas of race and ethnicity are embedded. We consider political attempts to manipulate the content and boundaries of race and ethnicity in and through debates about multiculturalism. Culture in these perspectives is theorised as a semi-autonomous domain in which concepts of race and ethnicity are situated.

Recommended Reading:


Further reading:


John Skrentny, chapter 4, ““We were advancing the really revolutionary view of discrimination”: Designating official minorities for affirmative action in employment’, and chapter 5, ““View of the existence of the other significant minorities”: The expansion of affirmative action for minority capitalists’, in The Minority Rights Revolution, Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002, pp. 85-164. JC571 SKR
Week 6: Reading week

Part 2: Race, ethnicity, and politics

Week 7: Politics as symbolic struggles

Here we return to some of the themes discussed in week 4 from the perspective of the state. We investigate different ways in which the state and associated political actors engage in various struggles to name, identify, classify, and define their preferred visions of racial and ethnic difference. Both the stakes and outcome of these discursive and symbolic struggles are the ways in which we understand race and ethnicity today.

Recommended reading:


Further reading:


Week 8: Politics as ethnic and racial mobilisation

In our second week on politics we turn to the ways in which race and ethnicity are the ongoing and changing products of political mobilisation. From this perspective, race and ethnicity are interest groups: they are fought over by different actors who organise to promote and disseminate their own vision of racial and/or ethnic difference in the world. These struggles suit both their symbolic and material interests. In the process of these struggles, race and ethnicity become legitimate (and legitimated) bases for social organisation.

Recommended reading:


Further reading:


Part 3: Race, ethnicity, and economics
Week 9: Economics as structure
In week 8, we begin our examination of the economic underpinnings of race and ethnicity in the modern world. Our starting point, building on the social constructivist paradigm, is that race and ethnicity do not have an independent existence in the world but rather must be understood in interaction with various economic structures. Here we consider Marxist and Weberian perspectives on this relationship between race and ethnicity on the one hand and economic structures on the other.

Recommended reading:

Further reading:
Week 10: Economics as structured inequalities
In our second week on the economic dimensions of race and ethnicity we examine the ways in which economic inequalities structured through processes of global migration become understood and represented as racial and ethnic differences. This returns us to the themes of slavery, colonialism, and migration discussed earlier in the term but now in contemporary comparative perspective.

Recommended reading:
Steve Fenton, chapter 6, ‘Migration and ethnicity’ in Ethnicity, Oxford: Polity, 2d ed rev. 2010, pp. 115-38. GN495.6 FEN

Further reading:

Conclusion
Week 11: Everyday life and race and ethnicity
We round out our theoretical discussion of race and ethnicity by questioning its everyday meaning and salience. The basic question here, following from our examination of the structural determinants of race and ethnicity, is, ‘who cares?’ We turn our attention to individual actors and their agency in producing and reproducing race and ethnicity in the world today. To what extent do ordinary people’s understandings of race and ethnicity follow from those privileged in and circulated through official discourse and policy? We adopt a critical stance toward the manifestations of race and ethnicity in everyday life.

Recommended reading:


HT1521 BAC


HT1521 RAC


Fran Tonkiss, chapter 1, ‘Community and solitude: Social relations in the city’, and chapter 2, ‘Spaces of difference and division’, in *Space, the City and Social Theory: Social Relations and Urban Forms*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005, pp. HT110 TON


Further reading:


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 11 pt. 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 synthesize 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 data 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