

## Grading guidelines autumn 2022

### ECONOMIC ANTHROPOLOGY

Generally, students **must use at least 3 texts from the reading list**. They can draw on other readings and sources, news items, film and music to make your paper stronger, but with at least the stipulated number of reading list texts. Discussion questions require that they have a viewpoint that they argue well for and balance against other possible positions.

A: These papers are **exceptional**. They illustrate excellence in that they bring in a large range of readings from across the course, demonstrating how these readings speak to each other. These papers thus show not only full understanding of the key reference points for the question, but also independent thinking and creativity. They naturally cover the key readings that are obvious reference points for the topic in question but also bring in a wide range of other relevant readings from the course and indeed possibly from beyond. The answers shed fresh light on the key concepts or topics. For example an answer on labour might obviously reference readings on labour, but would also point out how Mick Taussig's article on the commodity fetishism alludes to labour relations, and/or how commodities encapsulate labour, and/or how one economic sphere that Barth describes is animated by a labour-beer nexus, and/or how Weiner points out how female labour is intrinsic to the meaning of kula, and/or how the labour process slowdowns discussed by Scott are central to resistance, and/or how Tsing's analysis of mushroom sorting potentially call into question what is labour etc. We value personal, historical, and generally extracurricular examples in this course; if written with sophistication, they bring out a better understanding of the concepts.

B: These papers are **very good** in the way that they show good understanding of the key readings relevant to the topic at hand and bring in some comparison with other literature across the course. This will not be of the same degree as an A grade either in terms of range or sophistication of argument. They will bring in some comparison and show a degree of understanding of connections. For example an answer on markets will reference Polanyi on fictitious commodities and might attempt an obvious cross-reading across the course (for example mentioning Harvey's history of neoliberalism, or Dolan's discussion of introducing new commodities to Western Africa) without going more deeply into papers that also problematise the making of markets less obviously. For example, Zaloom's discussion on the making of financial market through masculinity and competition might not be referenced. Indeed, the writing that warrants a B can be great, but might lack originality and independent thinking – might be the work of a laborious student but not a paper that stands out due to capacity to synthesise.

C: These papers are **good**. They show a good enough level of understanding of the basic concepts of the key texts for the topic involved and have at least one small comparison across the course syllabus that is not entirely inaccurate. For example, in answering the 3<sup>rd</sup> question, a C paper would clearly talk about Graeber, and might bring in feminist critique as a general idea.

D: These papers are **satisfactory**: They show a basic if sometimes incomplete knowledge of the key readings and have little or no accurate reading across the syllabus. They do reference readings but they might not show a good grasp of them.

E: These papers are **adequate**: They show some understanding of the key texts or issues but with significant gaps or errors and little or no accurate reading across the syllabus. They might reference in a very superficial way, or show lack of understanding, or veer slightly off topic.

F: These papers **fail**. They do not reference the key texts or arguments or use them in a significantly inaccurate manner.