GRADING RUBRIC A: Guidelines for evaluating the textual part (essay/article) belonging to the Master Thesis Project of Visual Ethnography (40 % of the grade).

Criteria	Outstanding/ Very Good 9	Good 7.5	Pass 6	Fail/ Poor 4.5	Fail 3
Argument	original and sophisticated argument that sustains thesis and opens up new horizons for further research, combining critical thinking and academic rigor	clear but not especially sophisticated or original argument that nevertheless sustains thesis, showing evidence of critical thinking and academic rigor, but not consistently maintained presentation of the argument is logically developed	presents argument of its own, but with less evidence of critical thinking and academic rigor, either over-relying on other scholars' arguments or not providing evidence for dismissal of arguments presentation of the argument might lack clarity, but attempt at structuring has been made	argument remains largely implicit; more a summary of a leading article presentation of argument reads like a list	absence of own argument or argument unrelated to issue at hand presentation of the argument might be hard to follow
Theoretical basis	shows original and sophisticated engagement w/ the relevant anthrop/sociol literature and excellent understanding of main concepts and their relations; methodologically strongly related to the course Large Issues, Small Places: Theorizing Ethnographic Research	shows sustained engagement w/ the relevant anthrop/soc literature and clear understanding of key concepts and their relations, but level of sophistication a bit lower than previous category; methodologically related the course Large Issues, Small Places: Theorizing Ethnographic Research	addresses key concepts raised in the relevant anthrop/sociol literature, but without critically relating them to each other; minimal use of methodological agenda of t the course Large Issues, Small Places: Theorizing Ethnographic Research, even when possible connections are apparent, but no major misstatements	superficial engagement w/the relevant anthrop/sociol literature; might also display some uncertainty about or misunderstandings of main issues, but no fundamental errors; no or minimal evidence of insights provided by the course Large Issues, Small Places: Theorizing Ethnographic Research	minimal engagement w/the relevant anthrop/sociol literature; might be also be marred by basic misunderstandings of main issues or key points; no evidence of insights provided by the course Large Issues, Small Places: Theorizing Ethnographic Research
Analysis of data + complexity of the (collected) data	original and sophisticated understanding of and engagement w/ assumptions, methods and sources rich collection of ethnographic data or quantitative findings derived from original, in-depth and sophisticated/systematic research	clear understanding of and engagement w/assumption, methods and sources some carefully collected ethnographic data or quantitative findings derived from original and systematic research that sustain convincing (small) case studies	partial engagement w/assumptions, methods or sources, but assessment is too harsh or too lenient sufficient amount of not especially rich or detailed ethnographic data or quantitative findings derived from systematic research	assessment of assumptions, methods and sources displays serious shortcomings minimal amount of ethnographic data or quantitative findings, lacking both in quality (richness of detail and complexity) and quantity, no appearance of being successful to do systematic research	no or inappropriate analysis of assumptions, methods, and sources minimal or no evidence of ethnographic data or quantitative findings deriving from original research; not giving account of absence of effort to work systematically (=methodologically inspired)
Language and references correct	flawless or almost flawless use of language (including spelling and grammar); one referencing system consistently applied throughout the text and in the bibliography	acceptable use of language, including correct spelling and grammar, except for some minor typos; mostly consistent use of referencing system, safe a few minor incidental errors		typos and errors in both referencing and main text; insufficiently attention paid to style and reference issues	thesis difficult to read because of language and style issues

GRADING RUBRIC B: Guidelines for evaluating the audio-visual part (film) belonging to the Master Thesis Project of Visual Ethnography (60 % of the grade).

Criteria	Outstanding/ Very Good 9	Good 7.5	Pass 6	Fail/ Poor 4.5	Fail 3
Argument	Original and sophisticated argument (audio-visual montage), combining critical thinking and rigorous research Presentation of the argument demonstrates creative and coherent use of shots and sequences reflecting excellent anthropological understanding and ethnographic knowledge Argument sustains thesis project and opens up new horizons for further research	Clear, but not especially sophisticated or original, argument (audio-visual montage), indicating critical thinking and rigorous research, but not necessarily in combination Presentation of the argument demonstrates logical use of shots and sequences, but not necessarily creative or complex; inconsistently reflecting anthropological understanding and ethnographic knowledge Argument sustains thesis project, but not consistently maintained	Apparent argument (audio-visual montage), showing inconsistent critical thinking and rigorous research, but not providing substantial key evidence Presentation of the argument might lack clarity, but attempt at structuring has been made using adequate shots and sequences, but neither creative nor complex The montage insufficiently reflects anthropological understanding and ethnographic knowledge Argument relates to thesis project, but not consistently substantiated	Argument (audio-visual montage), remains largely implicit; more a summary of research activities than a coherent argument Presentation of argument relies on a passive presentation of visible and/or audible evidence, rather than logical shots and sequences	Absence of argument or audio-visual montage bears no relation to issue at hand Presentation of the argument might be hard to follow
Theoretical basis	Original and sophisticated engagement w/ the relevant anth/soc literature and multi-modal scholarship Demonstrates excellent understanding of themes and topics and critical engagement with related key concepts Methodologically and epistemologically strongly related to the master's programme (including the course Large Issues, Small Places: Theorizing Ethnographic Research)	Sustained engagement w/ the relevant anth/soc literature and/or multi-modal scholarship Demonstrates clear understanding of themes and topics and engagement with related key concepts Methodologically and epistemologically related to master's programme (including the course Large Issues, Small Places: Theorizing Ethnographic Research)	Addresses the relevant anth/soc literature and/or multi-modal scholarship Addresses themes and topics and engagement with key concepts, but without critically relating them to each other Methodologically minimal reference to master's programme (including the course Large Issues, Small Places: Theorizing Ethnographic Research)	Superficial engagement w/the relevant anth/soc literature and/or multi-modal scholarship Displays some uncertainty about or misunderstandings of themes and topics and poor engagement with related key concepts, but no fundamental errors Insignificant evidence of insights provided by master's programme (including the course Large Issues, Small Places: Theorizing Ethnographic Research)	Minimal engagement w/the relevant anth/soc literature and/or multi-modal scholarship Marred by basic misunderstandings of themes and topics that can be related to key concepts No evidence of insights provided by master's programme (including the course Large Issues, Small Places: Theorizing Ethnographic Research)

Analysis of data + complexity of the (collected) data	Original and sophisticated understanding of place & population studied, evidenced by a creative and well-crafted interpretation of research, including attention to technical, aesthetic, and ethical issues via rapport and/or reflexivity Rich collection of ethnographic sounds, images, and ideas gathered from original, in-depth, and systematic research Empirically driven analysis of ethnographic audiovisual data shows complexity & nuance	Clear understanding of place & population studied, evidenced by an accurate interpretation of research, including inconsistent attention to technical, aesthetic, and ethical issues via rapport and/or reflexivity Some carefully collected ethnographic sounds, images, and ideas gathered from original and systematic research Empirically driven analysis of ethnographic audiovisual data sustained by convincing (small) case studies	Partial understanding of place & population studied, evidenced by an account of research, but shows minimal awareness to technical, aesthetic, and ethical issues via rapport and/or reflexivity Sufficient amount of ethnographic sounds, images, and ideas gathered from systematic research Empirically driven analysis of ethnographic audiovisual data, but not especially rich or detailed	Assessment of place & population studied displays serious shortcomings Insignificant amount of ethnographic sounds, images, and ideas gathered, but with little appearance of being successful in doing systematic research Empirically lacking of ethnographic audiovisual data both in quality (richness of detail and complexity) and quantity (variety of samples and perspectives)	No or inappropriate analysis of place & population studied Minimal or no evidence of ethnographic sounds, images, and ideas gathered, and giving no account of effort to work systematically
Academic Conventions	Flawless or almost flawless use of equipment settings: Camera (handling, focus, exposure, white balance, etc.), Microphone (sounds levels, mic placement, etc.), and Editing (sync sound/image, clean edits, etc.) Effective and appropriate use of cinematic grammar & techniques: framing, angles, style, shots, etc.) Correct and appropriate use of textual elements: titles, subtitles, acknowledgements, credits, etc.	Acceptable use of equipment settings, but may include some minor or incidental errors: Camera (handling, focus, exposure, white balance, etc.), Microphone (sounds levels, mic placement, etc.), and Editing (sync sound/image, clean edits, etc.) Generally acceptable and appropriate use of cinematic grammar & techniques, but may include some minor or incidental errors: (framing, angles, style, shots, etc.) Generally acceptable and appropriate use of textual elements, but may include some minor or incidental errors: titles, subtitles, acknowledgements, credits, etc.	Sufficient use of equipment settings, but includes some major and/or several minor errors: Camera (handling, focus, exposure, white balance, etc.), Microphone (sounds levels, mic placement, etc.), and Editing (sync sound/image, clean edits, etc.) Sufficient use of cinematic grammar & techniques, but includes some major and/or several minor errors: (framing, angles, style, shots, etc.) Sufficient use of textual elements, but includes some major and/or several minor errors: titles, subtitles, acknowledgements, credits, etc.	Weak use of and insufficient attention paid to equipment settings, including a variety of major and minor errors: Camera (handling, focus, exposure, white balance, etc.), Microphone (sounds levels, mic placement, etc.), and Editing (sync sound/image, clean edits, etc.) Weak use of and insufficient attention paid to cinematic grammar & techniques, including a variety of major and minor errors: (framing, angles, style, shots, etc.) Weak use of and insufficient attention paid to textual elements, including a variety of major and minor errors: titles, subtitles, acknowledgements, credits, etc.	Thesis difficult to comprehend due to severity of weaknesses