Grading
The goals of these papers are 1) to show understanding of and evaluate the complex arguments made in assigned readings, and, more importantly, 2) to engage in a process of critical inquiry, synthesizing a new, original argument of your own. In order to do this effectively, you also need to have control over the structural (thesis, argument, evidence, quotations) and mechanical basics (citations, grammar, word choice, etc.) of writing. Consider the following rubric for paper writing (adapted from Stanford’s “IHUM”) as a loose guide:

A-range Papers
- Argument/Originality: The submitted work is outstanding in form and content. It is original, or it expands in a new way on ideas presented in the course. The analysis or interpretation is not only unified and coherent, but also complex and nuanced.
- Structure: The evidence presented in support of the claims is carefully chosen and deftly handled. Paper has a clear and concisely-stated thesis at the outset and arguments are clearly related to this thesis. Evidence is provided to support all statements and “Sign-Post” sentences make structure clear.
- Research/Sources: Well-chosen sources reflect the breadth of the academic discussions in the field. Sources are used with a clear understanding of the entire article, but only relevant points specifically needed as evidence are given. Citations are always present where needed, correct, and specific.
- Basics: Follows completely the assignment’s requirements. The paper is free or nearly free of any typographic or grammatical mistakes. Words are chosen carefully and used correctly and clearly.

B-range Papers
- Argument/Originality: The submitted work meets the requirements for the assignment, is clear and coherent and presents evidence in support of its points. It shows comprehension of the material and manifests critical thinking about the issues raised in the course. It does not demonstrate the complexity, the insight, or the integrated structure of A-range work.
- Structure: As for “A-range” papers.
- Research/Sources: Sources are clearly understood and appropriate. Evidence is usually clearly connected to arguments, although it can sometimes resort to long summaries rather than carefully chosen references. Citations as with A-range papers.
- Basics: As for “A-range” papers.

C-range Papers
- Argument/Originality: The submitted work has some, but not all of the basic components required; for example, it may offer an argument but it present no evidence to support the argument; or it may repeat concepts presented in lecture or readings without expanding on them.
- Structure: The paper may not have a thesis or the evidence provided may not relate to the thesis as stated. Several sections may engage (and even show understanding of) course themes and readings, but they do not come together to create a coherent argument.
- Research/Sources: Some sources may not be appropriate (such as book reviews, or peer-reviewed sources in the wrong field) and discussions of them may include minor misunderstandings. Minor parts of the argument may be missing support from research. Sources may be used more for small facts rather than important ideas, sometimes appearing to be added simply to reach the minimum required number. Citations may be partial or less frequent than needed, but are generally present at least for quotations.
- Basics: Argument may be impeded by grammar, punctuation, spelling, awkward or poor word-choice.

D-range Papers
- Argument/Originality: A coherent argument is not present. Large portions of the paper may not engage with relevant issues, or may misunderstand them.
- Structure: As for “C-range” papers, but substantial misunderstandings of the sources considered may be present as well.
- Research/Sources: Sources may be inappropriate (such as non-peer reviewed ones) and/or too few. Large parts of the argument may not be supported with research, and research presented may include or imply substantial misunderstandings of the sources consulted. Citations may be partial or missing for many facts and ideas, and citation issues may sometimes rise to the level of unintentional plagiarism.
- Basics: Major components of the assignment may be missing. Substantial mechanical issues prevent a reader from understanding portions of the text.

Citations and Sources
You must always include full citations! This includes both in-text citations, where you attribute quotes, paraphrasing, and significant pieces of information that are not common knowledge to particular parts of particular sources, and a “Works Cited” section with full bibliographic information. See below.

Sources: Wikipedia is not peer-reviewed!
- You cite sources to give credit (see below) but also as authorities justifying something as true. So sources must be credible for the purpose for which you are using them.
- Even those with PhDs in a field usually submit their ideas to other experts in a process called “peer review” before those ideas are published. Only some works are peer-reviewed, and these are the most trustworthy: academic journals and some books.
- Popular magazines, newspapers, and internet sites are rarely peer-reviewed.
- In general, ask yourself if you trust the source you are reading before you use it: what are the author(s) qualifications, reputation, and what kind of publication is it?
- The contents of many internet sites are not only not peer reviewed, they are sometimes simply made up or just contain opinions without evidence or full understanding of the issues involved.

Plagiarism: it can be by accident, includes paraphrasing, and is very serious!
- Plagiarism is claiming (expressly or implicitly) someone else’s work as your own.
- This includes use of direct quotes (using the same words) without citation, but also includes un-cited use of others’ ideas, such as a paraphrased version of another’s work.
- Violations can be intentional or unintentional, and could result in expulsion!
- For more: http://umd.umich.edu/policies_st-rights

When in doubt, cite! Here’s how, Part I: In-text Citations:
When providing facts from authoritative sources or using others ideas, you must say so right in the text of your paper. Anthropologists usually use parenthetical in-text citations (other fields use footnotes, endnotes, or different formats). Use the author’s last name(s), the year the work was published, then a colon (“:”) and the page numbers where that idea, fact, etc. can be found. Examples:
- Some spectacular wall paintings, including one of what appears to be a hunting scene, were discovered at Çatalhöyük (Balter 2006: 23).
- Balter (2006: 23) describes one wall painting at Çatalhöyük as showing “five or six red men, some dressed in animal skins, [who] appeared to be chasing a herd of seven red deer.” (Note that minor changes for grammar are allowed, but like all alterations from an original, these must be clearly identified with square brackets. Use ellipses (“…”) for omissions.)
- Hodder and Cessford (2004: 22) write that at Çatalhöyük “even the least-elaborate houses contain some paintings.”
- The spectacular wall paintings at the Neolithic site of Çatalhöyük have been the subject of much discussion (e.g., Balter 2006: 23; Hodder and Cessford 2004: 22).
- A pattern of “collegiate contextualism” can be described guiding architectural choices towards a unified campus aesthetic (Laura Jones, pers. comm.).
Part II: Works Cited:
At the end of the paper, you provide more information about the works you have cited earlier. Always provide enough information that anyone can find where you got your information:

Balter, Michael
2006 The Goddess and the Bull. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Hodder, Ian, and Craig Cessford

More Information: For other formats (multiple authors, chapters in edited volumes, unpublished or archival material, etc.) or when in doubt, follow the conventions of the American Anthropological Association’s Style Guide: http://www.aaanet.org/publications/style_guide.pdf.