

EXAMINATOR'S GUIDANCE, POL1005, GEOPOLITICAL RISK, SPRING 2020

The exam task gives substantial room for originality and individual analysis. Three hours is not a lot for such a task. It is very important that students jump straight into the matter at hand and start *analyzing* relevant geopolitical trends. Weak texts, one would suspect, more or less list a number of risks without proper justification for their inclusion, and without explaining *why* they are important and which mechanisms account for their likely impact on Equinor. Strong texts will likely narrow the list, focusing on only a few (or maybe even only one) risks, while spending time and energy on justifying why these are the most relevant ones, explicating causal chains.

The exam task includes a list of possible questions to be explored. The students do not *have* to use elements from that list – again, as long as the choice of risk factors is adequately justified. Most of the items on the list are based on discussions, theories, empirics, and lessons from the required readings. The text should reflect theoretical knowledge that goes beyond mere speculation based on current events.

Apart from being assessed based on the general quality of the text, grades are also determined by an overall assessment of various general dimensions. First, how extensive is the student's knowledge of the required readings? – and how well does the student apply this knowledge to the task at hand? Second, how is the text's level of precision? Third, how plausible are the arguments and conclusions put forth? Fourth, how relevant is the overall text? – is superfluous information minimized? Fifth, does the student sufficiently emphasize analysis over description? Sixth, is the text – overall – independently-crafted, or does it merely amount to recitations of lecture notes? Does the student present interesting and plausible reflections?

Students should also note that grades are given not only based on an assessment of a text's absolute quality; the relative quality of a text is also important (i.e. its quality compared to the texts of other students).

The general grade descriptions for the bachelor's level in the social sciences at NTNU read as thus (English version is translated from Norwegian by me):
<https://innsida.ntnu.no/wiki/-/wiki/Norsk/Karakterbeskrivelser+for+samfunnsvitenskapelige+fag>

A: Fremragende. Kandidaten behersker pensum på en fremragende måte. Begreper, teorier og empirisk kunnskap anvendes svært sikkert, selvstendig og reflektert ved drøfting av faglige problemstillinger. Korrekt bruk av kilder og referanser.

A: Excellent. The candidate's command of the curriculum is excellent. Concepts, theories, and empirical knowledge are employed extremely assuredly, independently,

and reflectively when discussing academic topics and questions. Correct use of sources and references.

B: Meget god. Kandidaten behersker pensum meget godt. Begreper, teorier og empirisk kunnskap anvendes meget sikkert, selvstendig og reflektert ved drøfting av faglige problemstillinger. Korrekt bruk av kilder og referanser.

B: Very good. The candidate's command of the curriculum is very good. Concepts, theories, and empirical knowledge are employed very assuredly, independently, and reflectively when discussing academic topics and questions. Correct use of sources and references.

C: God. Kandidaten behersker pensum godt. Begreper, teorier og empirisk kunnskap anvendes sikkert og selvstendig ved drøfting av faglige problemstillinger. I hovedsak korrekt bruk av kilder og referanser.

C: Good. The candidate's command of the curriculum is good. Concepts, theories, and empirical knowledge are employed assuredly, independently, and reflectively when discussing academic topics and questions. By and large correct use of sources and references.

D: Brukbar. Kandidaten har ufullstendige pensumkunnskaper. Begreper, teorier og empirisk kunnskap anvendes ujevnt. Visse mangler når det gjelder bruk av kilder og referanser.

D: Decent. The candidate's command of the curriculum is deficient. Concepts, theories, and empirical knowledge are employed unsteadily. Some deficiencies with regard to the use of sources and references.

E: Tilstrekkelig. Kandidaten har klart mangelfulle pensumkunnskaper. Vesentlige feil eller mangler når det gjelder anvendelse av begreper, teorier og empirisk kunnskap. Viser også svak forståelse ved drøfting av faglige problemstillinger.

E: Sufficient. The candidate's command of the curriculum is clearly deficient. There are major deficiencies with respect to the use of concepts, theories, and empirical knowledge. Also exhibits weak understanding when discussing academic topics and questions.

F: Ikke bestått. Kandidaten behersker selv ikke elementære deler av pensum. Store hull i kunnskapen eller feilaktig gjengivelse og anvendelse av sentrale begreper og teorier.

F: Not passed. The candidate lacks command even of the most elementary parts of the curriculum. Severe deficiencies with respect to knowledge, or incorrect rendering and use of central concepts and theories.