

## Assessment Guide SOS4510

The exam in SOS4510 consists in a short-term student paper (Max. 4000 words). The student will receive a grade between A and F.

The student defines the theme and objective of a 4000-word essay together with the course responsible. The essay is supposed to be empirical in nature but is neither meant to entail use of formal methods nor methodological reflections as to gathering of data. The basic idea is that the student describes and investigate a certain phenomenon chosen by him or herself and analyses it on the basis of the texts entailed in the curriculum – that is, unfolded or analysed through the use of perspectives, concepts or ideas from these texts. The different texts of the curriculum should make it possible for the student to access possible collective, political, ritual, social, symbolical, cultural, affective or "mediated" – dimensions to the researched object.

However, due to the intensive nature of the course and the limited number of cultural theories and perspectives presented, the *above requirements are not absolute*. The student may find other texts or perspectives *better suited* for certain empirical or theoretical purposes than the texts offered in the compendium, or he or she may find additional texts *complementing* or otherwise *strengthening* the analysis of the phenomenon under scrutiny. In that case – and only in that case – should the student draw in other texts.

*Please note! Due to the increasingly easy access to chatbots and AI which may help the students procure even complete student papers, notably #7-8 of the below assessment criteria will be enforced.*

The papers of the students will be graded after the following criteria:

1. Theoretical versus empirical work: Is the student in possession of sufficient basic theoretical knowledge for answering the question posed? Though the student paper is not meant to be *only* theoretical and in no way meant to entail exhaustive theoretical analyses (of a certain theory or theoretical perspective), it must be assessed whether the theoretical and conceptual work is solid, and whether the level of theoretical knowledge matches the sophistication of the empirical analysis.
2. Introducing concepts: Are concepts, theories and theoreticians used in the analysis properly introduced and defined?
3. Theoretical precision: How precise is the student in his or her use of concepts? Are their weak points? Lack of clarity? Imprecisions? Inconsistencies? Insecurities?
4. Narrative understandability: Is the student's text understandable? Does it progress in orderly fashion? Do the different parts of cohere? Is it possible to follow the student's thoughts or argument through his or her text?
5. Overview: Is the student capable of focussing on what is central to the phenomenon in question? Is the student capable of differentiating convincingly between central and more peripheral aspects? Are the most salient participatory, political or cultural aspects to the phenomenon included in the analysis? To what extent are eventual choices and priorities reflected and justified by the student?
6. Introduction: Is the chosen phenomenon investigated in the paper sufficiently introduced? Is it clear what the paper is about?
7. Selection of texts/theory: Is the selection of texts and perspectives reasonable in relation to the empirical focus? Are the right texts in the curriculum referenced?
8. Creativity: *Does the student bring original perspectives and observations for a day?* Does the student use theoretical concepts creatively, and if so does he or she explain or reflect eventual unorthodox, novel or original uses?
9. Self-criticism: Is the student reflexive about proper work? Conscious of lacuna? Possible dimensions to the phenomenon *not* developed? (s. also contained in #5)

10. Language: Are the student's language sufficiently grammatically correct? Are sentences (formally) well-formed?
11. Formality: Does the student comply with the formal requirements (length, style, references etc.)