

MEVIT3427/JOUR4427 Media, War and Journalism

The students worked on their term paper throughout the semester. The exam question was provided at the very beginning of the course. The obligatory assignment was a draft of at least 3 pages of the final submission. Students received personalized and extensive individual feedback on what to improve in view of the final submission.

2 presentations were given to the students (attachments provided): the first on how to write a term paper (at the beginning of the course); the second, delivered after they received personalized feedback on their obligatory assignment, covered the problematic issues I encountered most often in the papers and how to avoid them. Students have therefore received plenty of guidance on what they were expected to deliver in the term paper, and they had numerous opportunities to ask questions in case they had doubts.

GRADING CRITERIA

The criteria below apply to BA and MA papers. For the MA-level papers, the standards are applied a bit more strictly.

A

Extensive (or wide) reading and firm understanding of the sources. Develops an independent argument. Perhaps the argument is not crystal clear, but the student shows confidence in using the sources to advance her/his position. Covers both theory and practical examples. Well structured, easy to follow.

B

Shows wide reading and good understanding of the sources. Addresses the question. It might not provide a very clear (or that convincing) answer, but there is an attempt to do so. Evidence of some critical approach to the sources consulted. Includes both theory and relevant examples. The text is mostly rich in content. It is structured. The text is coherent.

C

Shows reading (maybe not extensive) and attempts to address the question. It reports the content of the sources consulted. It includes theory and examples. There might be missing concepts and/or theories that would have added more nuance and depth. The text tends to remain on the surface. Not always clear what the answer is or at points it is not clear where the discussion is going, but the content is relevant. There is some attempt to address the sources critically.

D

Some, but limited reading and engagement with the course materials. Quite fragmented and more superficial than at C level. There are misunderstandings of the sources consulted. Lack of structure and/or sense of direction. Language is unclear and at points it is difficult to follow. Alternatively: OK text, but it has not really included much discussion of theories and concepts from the syllabus as requested by the exam briefing. This would include discussions of case studies that are mainly descriptive, but not really based on applying theories and concepts.

E

Sufficient. Below the minimum length, fragmented, shows little reading and engagement with the sources, although it mentions relevant issues. There are misunderstandings of the readings and/or errors.

F

Significantly below the minimum requirements.