

## CONL701

### CRITICAL RESEARCH FOR POSTGRADUATE STUDY

#### Assessment 2 – Case study: Climate change and ‘the 97%’

<b>Module title</b>	CONL701 Critical Research for Postgraduate Study
<b>Assessment title</b>	Case study: Climate change and ‘the 97%’
<b>Module leader</b>	Julie Mayers
<b>Issue date</b>	Week 4
<b>Submission date</b>	Monday Week 6, 13:00 (UK time)
<b>Module learning outcomes</b>	3. Manage different information sources and conflicting opinions 4. Present logical arguments
<b>Weighting</b>	35%
<b>Submission instructions</b>	<p>You will work on this assignment individually and submit your article as a single Microsoft Word (.doc or .docx) file through Canvas.</p> <p>Upon submission, an automated Turnitin check will be performed and unusually high levels of similarity will be flagged to the marker. By submitting this work, you confirm that you have read, understand and accept the university’s regulations regarding plagiarism and agree to be dealt with accordingly if any such situation should arise.</p>

<b>Task details and instructions</b>	<p><b><u>Climate Change</u></b></p> <p><i>Climate Change</i> may be the most heavily-debated topic in the world today. Although it could be misleading to suggest that ‘<i>opinion is split</i>’ (as in ‘<i>equally split</i>’), there is certainly strong disagreement in some quarters. However, integral to this dispute is the existence of a significant quantity of poor or irrelevant material or discussion, vested interest and misinformation; alongside good, verifiable, independent research. Your task is to research this topic <i>with an open mind</i> then write, in the style of a</p>
--------------------------------------	---

	<p>professional magazine article, a 1,000-word overview of the subject, considering and separating facts from assumptions, from opinion, from flagrant distortion. This, in turn must be based on credible, publicly-available material (which you cite) and not any of your own opinions or preconceptions.</p> <p><b><u>The ‘97%’</u></b></p> <p>Within this general discussion, a focus of your article should be the oft-quoted figure that, ‘<i>97% of the world’s climate experts agree that climate change has been caused by humans</i>’. What <i>exactly</i> is being claimed here? How, and from where, has this claim originated? How reliable and meaningful is the claim? Is the intended information always presented and portrayed helpfully and accurately? Are realistic conclusions always drawn (by everyone)?</p> <p><b><u>Conclusions</u></b></p> <p>Having discussed climate change in both general and specific terms, your article should close with appropriate conclusions regarding the severity and causes of climate change. These should follow logically from your main article and, again should not be based on prejudice.</p> <p><b><u>References</u></b></p> <p>Your article must be supported by an appropriate reference base (cited list of references in IEEE format) of publicly available and credible sources. References do <i>not</i> count towards the 1,000 word count.</p>
--	---

<b>Late submissions</b>	All required work must be submitted, in full and as directed and described, by the due time and date, to achieve marks reflecting its full worth. Work submitted after the due time and date, but within one calendar week, will be capped at 40%. Work more than a week late will not be marked and will be entered as 0%.
<b>Guidance</b>	A particular challenge of this assignment will be to condense such a broad discussion into 1,000 words. This will require careful planning and structuring of your work together with efficient use of language.

	Note the requirement for IEEE referencing: <a href="https://www.ieee.org/conferences/publishing/templates.html">https://www.ieee.org/conferences/publishing/templates.html</a> (IEEE two-column paper formatting is <i>not</i> required for this assessment, though it will be for the Assessment 2)
<b>Marking criteria</b>	See the attached marking criteria for individual assessment details.
<b>Feedback policy</b>	Individual feedback will be given through Canvas within three weeks of the submission date.

<b>Support arrangements</b>	<p><b><u>Discussion forum</u></b></p> <p>You are invited to discuss your ideas and progress with other students in the online discussion forums provided through Canvas.</p> <p><b><u>Module tutor</u></b></p> <p>In the first instance, questions should be addressed to your module tutor. You can find their details in the module introduction unit on Canvas. However, although they may, if appropriate, provide general guidance or clarify issues of interpretation or understanding, they are not usually able to give specific or focused advice on questions relating to material within the assignment.</p> <p><b><u>Module leader</u></b></p> <p>If you have further questions, you can contact Julie Mayers, the module leader.</p>
<b>Marking and moderation policy</b>	<p>All work is marked by your module tutor and moderated by the module leader to ensure quality and consistency.</p>

## MARKING CRITERIA

The following table documents indicative marking criteria for this assignment: For the 'article of 1,000 words', a range of +/-10% is tolerated before penalties are applied (900–1,100 words is acceptable without penalty). References do NOT count towards the word count.

ELEMENT	ASSESSMENT TASK	<40% (R):	40%+ (C):	50%+ (B):	60%+ (B+):	70%+ (A):
<b>General discussion and critical analysis</b>	<i>General discussion of causes and effects of climate change. Discuss credibility of claims and counter-claims</i>	Insufficient general discussion or insufficient depth. Insufficient or inappropriate critical analysis and evaluation	A reasonable general discussion, relevant for the most part, with some awareness and application of critical analysis and evaluation	A good, relevant general discussion, with sound awareness and application of critical analysis and evaluation	A very good, relevant general discussion, with complete awareness and strong application of critical analysis and evaluation	A professional, academic treatment of the general topic.
<b>Specific discussion and critical analysis</b>	<i>Specific discussion of '97% of climate change experts agree ...' quote</i>	Insufficient specific discussion or insufficient depth or inappropriate focus	A reasonable specific discussion, relevant for the most part, with some awareness and application of critical analysis and evaluation	A good, relevant specific discussion, with sound awareness and application of critical analysis and evaluation	A very good, relevant specific discussion, with complete awareness and strong application of critical analysis and evaluation	A professional, academic treatment of the specific topic.
<b>Conclusions</b>	<i>Logical conclusions to be drawn from the body of the discussion.</i>	Insufficient conclusions or mainly non-sequiturs drawn.	Some appropriate conclusions are drawn	Sound conclusions are drawn	Sound conclusions are drawn and demonstrated by clear argument	Conclusions are logically complete.
<b>Reference base</b>	<i>Provide a suitable set of verifiable sources to support your discussion</i>	Inadequate or inappropriate reference base	Adequate reference base in terms of size and focus. (Informal guide: 10+ credible references)	Sound reference base in terms of size and focus. (Informal guide: 15+ credible and varied references)	Good reference base in terms of size and focus. (Informal guide: 20+ credible and varied references)	Excellent reference base in terms of size and focus. (Informal guide: 25+ credible and varied references)