

Grading guidelines sosant 1300

A: These are papers that are *exceptional* in the ways that they bring in a *large* range of readings from across the course. 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 not only point out their connection to the themes and key readings of the topic involved but do so in a manner designed to shed fresh light on the key concepts or topics. For example an answer on gifts and commodities might tie it into the lecture on consumption to problematise the ways in which the category of consumption conflates gifts and commodity, explore the ways in which this is a matter of perspectival evaluation and brings to mind the earlier debates in economic theory to do with the rise of neoclassical theories of goods. This is just one potential example but it shows the degree of a) reading across texts and topics and b) sophistication in terms of bringing those different readings together to show linkages between them that we are looking for.

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 whether one's labour is one's property will reference the labour readings and then might reference Polanyi on fictitious commodities as an obvious cross-reading across the course without going more deeply into papers that also problematise ownership of labour less obviously. For example, does Taussig's analysis of the devil exchange or Tsing's analysis of mushroom sorting potentially call into question what is labour and who it belongs to – one could argue they do but more work needs to be done to make an argument than for example the more obvious comparison to Polanyi. This kind of work would be the exceptional work that warrants an A. Linkages with Polanyi and similar texts combined with a good understanding of the key texts would be very good and warrant a B.

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.

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.

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.

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