

**Anthropology 6103, Section 10**  
**Proseminar in Archaeology**  
Fall 2016, Tues 11:00-1:30, HAH 202

**Instructor:** Dr. Jeffrey Blomster  
**Office:** 303 HAH (2110 G St.), Telephone: 994-4880  
**Office Hours:** Thursday, 11:00 – 1:00, or by appointment.  
**E-mail:** blomster@gwu.edu

**General Course Description:**

This course offers graduate students an opportunity to explore issues related to archaeological theory, method and practice. Archaeologists study human culture, society and behavior through the material remains of human activities. In this class, we will examine how and why archaeologists make their interpretations, looking at methods, underlying theories and analogies, and the nature of the archaeological record – the practice of archaeology. Material culture, from early stone tools to modern Barbie dolls, as well as in depth explorations of specific Old and New World sites, will be utilized to analyze how archaeologists construct and support their arguments. We will also examine some of the more political aspects of archaeology, looking at the use – and abuse – of the past, Cultural Resource Management, public archaeology, as well as tension between archaeologists and descendant groups of the people they study, especially Native Americans. The readings include both classics and current works. Themes of the seminar for this semester are: nationalism, sex and gender, marketing heritage, public archaeology, materiality, and the archaeology of collective action.

**Learning Outcomes:**

- 1) learn, compare and critique archaeologists' appropriations of and contributions to theory;
- 2) understand how archaeology is situated in and contributes to anthropology;
- 3) explore how archaeologists develop methods and use data to advance arguments and theoretical positions;
- 4) consider how archaeology impacts the identities of living people, and how archaeology has served – both willingly and unwillingly – nationalistic agendas;
- 5) explore how archaeologists can best articulate their finds to the public and involve them – and interest and/or serve them – in research;
- 6) focus on how archaeology and heritage issues can positively impact community development.

There are no prerequisites for this course. Students are expected to come to class prepared to engage in an informed discussion of required readings.

**Grading:**

There will be one essay, 1 critique/presentation, a final project, and a final/qualifying exam.

These items are weighted as follows:

Essay 1/Seriation Problem	10%
Critique/presentation of articles	20%
Final Project	30%
Participation & Comments	10%
Qualifying exam	30%

The standard University system will be used to assign letter grades as follows: A = 92-100; A- = 90-91; B+ = 88-89; B = 82-87; B- = 80-81; C+ = 78-79; C = 72-77; C- = 70-71; D+ = 68-69; D = 62-67; D- = 60-61; F = 0-59.

**Textbooks:**

Six textbooks are required for the class, available at the bookstore and *on reserve at Gelman*:  
*Archaeology: Original Readings in Method and Practice*, edited by P. Peregrine, C. Ember, and M. Ember, 2002, Prentice Hall.

*Etlatongo: Social Complexity, Interaction and Village Life in the Mixteca Alta of Oaxaca, Mexico*, J. Blomster, 2004, Wadsworth.

*Marketing Heritage: Archaeology and the Consumption of the Past*, edited by Y. Rowan and U. Baram, 2004, Altamira.

*The Archaeology of Collective Action*, D. Saitta, 2007, University Press of Florida.

*Ancient Bodies, Ancient Lives: Sex, Gender, and Archaeology*, R. Joyce, 2008, Thames & Hudson.

*Entangled: An Archaeology of the Relationships between Humans and Things*, I. Hodder, 2012, Wiley-Blackwell.

**Class Schedule, Readings, and Assignments:**

Note: Arch = *Archaeology*; Etl = *Etlatongo*; Ent = *Entangled*; MH = *Marketing Heritage*; CA = *The Archaeology of Collective Action*. All other readings are on Blackboard.

\* = read for background but won't be discussed.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic and Readings</b>	<b>Due</b>
08/30	What can Archaeology Contribute, and Why does it Matter? Skim: Arch, Chap. 21; Etl, Chap. 1; CA, Chap. 1; Ent, Chap. 1.	
09/06	The Power of Archaeology: Heritage, Uses and Abuses of the Past. <b>Read:</b> -Rathje, William and Cullen Murphy, 1992, What We Say, What We Do. In <i>Rubbish</i> , pp. 53-78. Harper Perennial. -Arch, Chap. 23. -MH, 1*, 10, 14. -Cuno, James, 2009, Introduction. In <i>Whose Culture? The Promise of Museums and the Debate over Antiquities</i> , edited by J. Cuno, pp. 1-35. Princeton University Press.	
09/13	Theory in American Archaeology: from Culture History to Processualism <b>Read:</b> -*Trigger, Bruce G., 1989, History and Contemporary American Archaeology: A Critical Analysis. In <i>Archaeological Thought in America</i> , edited by C.C. Lamberg-Karlovsky, pp. 19-34. Cambridge University Press. -Lyman, R. Lee, Michael J. O'Brien and Robert C. Dunnell, 1997, The Birth of Culture History. In <i>The Rise and Fall of Culture History</i> , pp. 33-72. Plenum Press. -Binford, Lewis R., 1972 [1962], Archaeology as Anthropology. In <i>An Archaeological Perspective</i> , edited by L.R. Binford, pp. 21-32. Seminar Press. -Watson, Patty Jo, Steven A. LeBlanc, and Charles L. Redman, 1971, The Logic of Science. In <i>Explanation in Archaeology: An Explicitly Scientific Approach</i> , pp. 3-19. Columbia University Press. -Binford, Lewis R., 1989, The "New Archaeology," then and now. In <i>Archaeological Thought in America</i> , edited by C.C. Lamberg-Karlovsky, pp. 50-62. Cambridge. -Arch, Chap. 15	

- 09/20 Processualism Transformed, Critiqued, and Rejected: Structuralism, Marxism, Darwinian Evolution, and Post-processualism.  
**Read:**  
 -Deetz, James, 1996 [1977], *Small Things Remembered*. In *In Small Things Forgotten*, Expanded and Revised Edition, pp. 165-186. Anchor Books.  
 -Saitta, Dean, 1994, Class and Community in the Prehistoric Southwest. In *The Ancient Southwestern Community: Models and Methods for the Study of Prehistoric Social Organization*, edited by W.H. Wills and R.D. Leonard, pp. 25-43. University of New Mexico Press.  
 -Neiman, Fraser, 2008, The Lost World of Monticello: an Evolutionary Perspective. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 64(2):161-194.  
 -Hodder, Ian, 1984, Archaeology in 1984. *Antiquity* 58:25-32.
- Case Study: Divergent Interpretations of Neolithic monuments in the UK:**  
 -Renfrew, Colin, 1973, Monuments, Mobilization and Social Organization in Neolithic Wessex. In *The Explanation of Culture Change: Models in Prehistory*, edited by C. Renfrew, pp. 539-558. University of Pittsburgh Press.  
 -Hodder, Ian, 1984, Burials, Houses, Women and Men in the European Neolithic. In *Ideology, Power and Prehistory*, edited by D. Miller and C. Tilley, pp. 51-68. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- 09/27 Theory: Critical Archaeology, Collective Action, Agency and Compromise?  
**Read:**  
 -Leone, Mark, 1984, Interpreting Ideology in Historical Archaeology: Using the Rules of Perspective in the William Paca Garden in Annapolis, Maryland. In *Ideology, Power and Prehistory*, edited by D. Miller and C. Tilley, pp. 25-35. Cambridge University Press.  
 -CA, Chaps. 2 and 3.  
 -Dobres, Marcia-Anne and John E. Robb, 2000, Agency in Archaeology: Paradigm or Platitude? In *Agency in Archaeology*, edited by M. Dobres and J. Robb, pp. 3-17. Routledge.  
 -Joyce, Arthur, Laura Arnaud Bustamante, and Marc Levine, 2001, Commoner Power: A Case Study from the Classic Period Collapse on the Oaxaca Coast. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 8(4):343-385.  
 -Hegmon, Michelle, 2003, Setting Theoretical Egos Aside: Issues and Theory in North American Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 68(2):213-243.
- 10/04 Marketing Heritage: Development, Tourism and Site Museums.  
**Read:**  
 -MH, Chaps. 5, 7, 12.  
 -Cyphers, Ann and Lucero Morales-Cano, 2006, Community Museums in the San Lorenzo Tenochtitlán Region, Mexico. In *Archaeological Site Museums in Latin America*, edited by H. Silverman, pp. 30-46. University Press of Florida.  
 -Mortensen, Lena, 2006, Experiencing Copán: The Authenticity of Stone. In *Archaeological Site Museums in Latin America*, edited by H. Silverman, pp. 47-63. University Press of Florida.  
 -Castillo Butters, Luis Jaime and Ulla Sarela Holmquist Pachas, 2006, Modular Site Museums and Sustainable Community Development at San José de Moro, Peru. In *Archaeological Site Museums in Latin America*, edited by H. Silverman, pp. 130-155. University Press of Florida.

- 10/11 Public Archaeology: **Freedmen's Cemetery Case Study**. Guest Lecturer: Dr. Pamela Cressey  
**Read:** MH, Chap. 15  
 Archaeology of Collective Action: **Ludlow Case Study**.  
**Read:** CA, Chaps. 4-8.
- 10/18 Chronology, Diachronic Change, and Survey/Sampling Strategies: How Archaeologists Get Dates and Find Sites. **Essay 1**  
**Read:**  
 -Arch, Chap. 2\*.  
 -Deetz, James, 1977, Remember Me as You Pass By. In *In Small Things Forgotten*, pp. 64-90. Anchor Books.  
 -Pearson, Marlys and Paul Mullins, 1999, Domesticating Barbie: An Archaeology of Barbie Material Culture and Domestic Ideology. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 3(4):225-259.  
 -Arch, Chap. 1\*.  
 -Plog, Stephen, 1976, Relative Efficiencies of Sampling Techniques for Archaeological Surveys. In *The Early Mesoamerican Village*, edited by K. Flannery, pp. 136-158. Academic Press.  
 -Arch, Chap. 20.  
**For Essay 1:**  
 -Seriation (T. Patterson).
- 10/25 No Class – GWU Fall Break
- 11/01 From Research Design to Excavation: Understanding Early Villages and Complexity in the New World. **Etlatongo Case Study**.  
**Read:** Etl, Chaps. 2-5, 7.
- 11/08 Things and Archaeology: Entangled.  
**Read:** Ent, Chaps. 2-10.
- 11/15 Floral, Faunal and Osteological Approaches.  
**Read:**  
 -Arch, Chap. 6\*, 7, 8\*, 10.  
 -Scott, Elizabeth M., 2001, Food and Social Relations at Nina Plantation. *American Anthropologist* 103(3):671-691.
- Interpretation and Analogy in Ceramic Studies: Ethnoarchaeology, Style and Interaction  
**Read:**  
 -Arch, Chap. 5.  
 -Hardin, Margaret A., 1979, The Cognitive Basis of Productivity in a Decorative Art Style: Implications of an Ethnographic Study for Archaeologists' Taxonomies. In *Ethnoarchaeology: Implications of Ethnography for Archaeology*, edited by C. Kramer, pp. 75-101. Columbia University Press.  
 -Hegmon, Michelle, James R. Allison, Hector Neff, and Michael D. Glascock, 1997,

Production of San Juan Red Ware in the Northern Southwest: Insights into Regional Interaction in Early Puebloan Prehistory. *American Antiquity* 62(3):449-463.  
-Etna, Chaps. 6\*, 8\*.

- |       |  |                            |
|-------|--|----------------------------|
| 11/22 | <p>Ethics: Nationalism, Indigenous Communities and Human Remains in Archaeology.<br/><b>Read:</b><br/>-MH, Chap. 9.</p> <p>In-class Debate: <i>Human Remains, NAGPRA, and Kennewick Man</i>.<br/>-Trigger, Bruce G., 1980, Archaeology and the Image of the American Indian. <i>American Antiquity</i> 45(4):662-676.<br/>-Clark, G.A., 1997, NAGPRA, the Conflict between Science and Religion, and the Political Consequences. <i>Society for American Archaeology Bulletin</i> 16(5):22, 24-25.<br/>-White Deer, Gary, 1998, Return of the Sacred: Spirituality and the Scientific Imperative. In <i>Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to a Common Ground</i>, edited by N. Swidler, et al, pp. 37-43. Altamira Press.<br/>-Dongoske, Kurt E., 2000 [1996], NAGPRA: A New Beginning, Not the End, for Osteological Analysis – A Hopi Perspective. In <i>Repatriation Reader: Who Owns American Indian Remains?</i>, edited by D.A. Mihesuah, pp. 282-293. University of Nebraska Press.<br/>-Watkins, Joe, 2000, The “Ancient One” of Kennewick. In <i>Indigenous Archaeology: American Indian Values and Scientific Practice</i>, pp. 135-154. Altamira, Walnut Creek.<br/>-Kelly, Robert, 2004, Kennewick Man is Native American. <i>The Society for American Archaeology Record</i> 4(5):33-37.</p> | <b>In-Class<br/>debate</b> |
| 11/29 | <p>Protecting the Past: CRM, Collecting and Claiming the Past.<br/><b>Read:</b><br/>-Raab, L. Mark, 1984, Achieving Professionalism through Ethical Fragmentation: Warnings from Client-Oriented Archaeology. In <i>Ethics and Values in Archaeology</i>, edited by E.L. Green, pp. 51-61. The Free Press.<br/>-MH, 2*, 3, 4, 8, 11</p>  | <b>Final<br/>Project</b>   |
| 12/06 | <p>Gendered Archaeology. <b>Goddesses &amp; Queens: Gender and Sex in Archaeology.</b><br/><b>Read:</b><br/>-Arch, Chap. 14*<br/>-<i>Ancient Bodies, Ancient Lives</i>.</p>  |                            |
| 12/12 | <p><b>Qualifying Exam – due in Department by 4:30.</b></p>   | <b>QE!</b>                 |

**Class Policies and Course Requirements:**

*Attendance, Participation and Comments*

It is critical that students attend every class. Lectures will form a very minor component of this class; instead, student presentations and discussions on readings will constitute the majority of the class. Students’ voices are encouraged – and expected! Students are expected to come to class with the reading done, and, crucially, ready to comment on the reading. An important part of the grade will be comprised of the student’s informed participation in discussions. A reasonable amount of readings have been selected for discussion on each day of class; students must arrive ready to discuss the assigned readings that appear on the syllabus for that day. Read the articles in the order in which they are listed. Some articles have been marked with an asterisk, meaning they

are to be read but will not be discussed in class (although they will be **briefly summarized by the presenter**; see below).

As part of the participation grade, each week students will email me a minimum one-paragraph comment on the readings. This should be sent to me by noon of the Monday before class (blomster@gwu.edu); do not send them to me late. Use the comment as a chance to grapple with the arguments that are presented in the texts for that week. Students might choose to compare authors for that week, or could choose to argue with a particular aspect of one of the texts. The key is that for each comment, the student engages with something in detail. Do not simply regurgitate the argument, as this exercise is not intended to test comprehension, which is assumed. Students do not need to complete a comment in the week in which they present.

If a class is missed, the assignment for that day must be handed in as scheduled unless there has been a prior agreement made with the instructor. A third of a letter grade will be deducted for each day an assignment is late.

#### *Double jeopardy*

If you are scheduled to discuss articles on the same day that another assignment is due, this is double jeopardy – thus, you have an automatic extension until the **Monday** before the next class for that other assignment, allowing you to focus on your in-class presentation.

#### *Article Summary, Critique and Presentation*

Each week, student(s) will present a broad overview of the week's readings, synthesizing and critiquing the major points of the articles. If two students are assigned for one week, it is up to the students to decide how they wish to divide and present the articles. Students will present and discuss the readings in the order listed on the syllabus. If a particular archaeological site is discussed extensively in an article, please include relevant background information and **one image of it** in your presentation. Presenters must also include brief summaries of the main points of articles that are marked as NOT to be discussed. Students are encouraged to prepare a powerpoint presentation; *it is the responsibility of the presenter to have their presentation loaded and ready to show from the room's projector by 10 am!* By **noon on the day before class**, the discussant will place on Blackboard two provocative questions about each reading that she/he would like the class to consider (see "Discussions" section on Blackboard menu for this class). They do **NOT** have to post questions for the articles marked by an asterisk. Though the exact structure of the presentation is up to each student, please attend to the following: 1) briefly cover the main arguments of the readings; 2) outline the kinds of data the author uses to support his/her points; 3) state the extent to which you agree or disagree with the arguments made; 4) present questions for discussion. *Do not simply summarize the readings; instead, interpret, explore, and react intelligently.* I will grade as follows: 1/3<sup>rd</sup> for demonstrated knowledge of the text as demonstrated in the presentation and the essay; 1/3<sup>rd</sup> for the quality of questions asked; and 1/3<sup>rd</sup> for the quality and duration of the ensuing discussion.

On the same day as their presentation, students will submit a roughly 7-10 page essay that summarizes and **critiques** the readings they covered, assessing how well the author made their arguments.

#### *Essay 1 – Seriation Problem*

For the week in which we explore chronology and dating techniques, each student will perform a seriation analysis on a group of ceramic vessels. The exercise and examples are included with the October 18<sup>th</sup> readings. Examine the vessels, create charts or diagrams that help you, and write a 4 to 6-page essay explaining the underlying concepts of seriation, the temporal order of the vessels and why you have organized them this way. So, like the majority of the articles we read this

semester, you will be explaining how you reached your interpretations; include all supporting documentation in your report. An additional article on seriation (by Deetz) for that class will further help students master the concept of seriation. The article on diachronic changes in Barbie may also help. The results will be discussed, and the essay due, on October 18<sup>th</sup>.

### *Final Project*

Students have a choice of **two** different options for the final project that will encourage them to synthesize and apply what they have learned in class about theory, method and practice. Treat either option as a grant proposal. While you should include a budget, you can simply provide rough estimates for costs. The goal is to make sure you propose something that is realistic; that could actually be funded, and does not request techniques and analyses that are extremely expensive and invite extensive scrutiny during the review process.

**Please carefully examine the attached “Final Paper Rubric” for details on paper requirements and grading procedures.**

#### Option 1. Design a Site Museum for Etlatongo, Ludlow, or Freedmen’s Cemetery

This project is focused on sites that you will have the most background on – Etlatongo, Ludlow, and the Freedmen’s Cemetery, Alexandria. Additional resources for each will be available either on the Blackboard site for the class (for Etlatongo) or the various websites for the Freedmen’s Cemetery - [www.AlexandriaArchaeology.org](http://www.AlexandriaArchaeology.org) (see “discoveries”) or [www.FreedmensCemetery.org](http://www.FreedmensCemetery.org). Official – and unofficial – websites provide substantial visual information on Ludlow as well.

Throughout the semester, we have read articles that focus on communicating archaeology to the public. Site museums can be an extremely effective tool for educational, heritage and socio-political objectives, as well as many of the development-related issues focused on in *Marketing Heritage*. Drawing explicitly from the chapters from that book, as well as the three chapters we read from *Archaeological Site Museums in Latin America* (the book is on reserve at Gelman if you wish to refer to it for additional examples), prepare a proposal to design a site museum. Several objectives must be met – how would you communicate:

- the goals of archaeology
- archaeological method and theory, including YOUR epistemology/theoretical perspective
- stewardship concepts
- for all sites, on which past do you focus? For example, for the Freedmen’s Cemetery, do you focus just on the past relevant to the African-American experience, or do you incorporate the Native American past as well, such as the Clovis point found during the excavations?
- the modern community’s relation to the past, as well as other stakeholders
- importance of nationalism/heritage

For your proposal, write an overview of how you would meet the above objectives, plus additional ones that you think – and can explain why – are important. Prepare sample script for **10 artifacts and/or images**; include them as an appendix, not within the paper’s text. Discuss conservation, preservation and security issues. How would you balance local community needs and professional standards? If you intend to promote tourism, how would you do so, for what level (local, regional, national, etc.) would you aim, and under what restrictions – if any?

#### Option 2. Return to Etlatongo.

Write an in-depth research proposal for a follow up archaeological project at Etlatongo. Much of the research reported in the Etlatongo book was an initial offering or contribution to determine basic data about the site; there is no shortage of potential follow-up projects. With the cooperation of the aged excavator of the site, you have decided to prepare and execute a field project at

Etlatongo. You may focus on any time period present at the site, and may pursue any relevant anthropological issue(s). This will require several important steps:

- discuss what goals/issues are of interest to you
- based on the above, prepare a research or thesis statement; this should also include your theoretical interests, and the larger issues that your proposed project would impact
- how do you frame your research statement? As a hypothesis, etc.?
- operationalize your research statement – go through each step of the research process, discussing what methods you would employ. What kind of data would you expect, and how will you most effectively search for it?
- make sure you include 5 methods NOT previously used at Etlatongo (for example, NAA could not be one of the 5!)
- how would you articulate with the local community?

### *Qualifying Examination*

Students will have a week to complete the qualifying exam. The exam will require knowledge of material from class lectures, discussions, and readings. The exam will **not require research** – all of the resources read for class will be sufficient to complete it. The questions will be distributed the final day of class, and must be returned on December 12<sup>th</sup>.

### *Academic Integrity and Ethics*

All students will work individually on all assignments unless otherwise instructed. Students are expected to adhere to the GW Code of Academic Integrity. It states: “Academic dishonesty is defined as cheating of any kind, including misrepresenting one’s own work, taking credit for the work of others without crediting them and without appropriate authorization, and the fabrication of information.” For the remainder of the code, see: <http://www.gwu.edu/~ntegrity/code.html>.

### *Students with extra challenges*

Any student who may need an accommodation based on the potential impact of a disability should contact the Disability Support Services (DSS) office at 202-994-8250 in the Marvin Center, Suite 242, to establish eligibility and coordinate reasonable accommodations. If a student anticipates such accommodations, please advise me immediately. Keep in mind that reasonable accommodations are not provided retroactively.

Also, the University Counseling Center (UCC) offers 24/7 assistance and referral to address students’ personal, social, career, and study skills problems. Call them at 202-994-5300.

### *Security*

In the case of an emergency, if at all possible, the class should shelter in place. If our building is impacted, follow the evacuation procedures for the building.

### **Important Dates:**

10/18 – Essay 1

11/29 – Final Project

12/12 – Qualifying Exam due in the department office by 4:30

# Final Paper Rubric for Anth. 6103

(with thanks to Dr. A. Dent)

## 1) General Description and Length:

This document provides general goals that supplement the very specific requirements for your paper found on pp. 6-8 (what some would call “the prompt”). It explains how to go about completing the assignment, and also how your assignment will be graded.

The purpose of this assignment is for you to apply course concepts to the creation of a site museum or an excavation project. For either option, this paper should exercise your critical thinking skills, in that you are expected to critically engage with the underlying theoretical, methodological concepts, as well as archaeological practice and ethics, discussed in the course. Competing, often contradictory, epistemologies, responsibilities of archaeologists to the public, and different methods, each with positive and negative features, should be considered. As noted in the prompt for the site museum option, the goal is to present and explain concepts, including your underlying epistemology, to whatever public you define for the assignment, while also critiquing and supporting these concepts. Ask yourself, are the concepts effective in the ways that the authors we have read have defined them? In terms of a site museum, is there a model that has been presented that you can apply, with appropriate tweaking and critique? There is also an expectation that you will attend to these issues, but on a reduced scale, if you choose option 2. For option 2, pay especial attention to ensuring that the methods you choose allow you to explore the larger anthropological issues raised in your thesis/research statement.

For all these reasons, your thesis in this paper will be an argument about the way in which your museum/model (option 1) or excavation project (option 2) challenge or support the concepts from the course. This thesis should come early in the paper – probably in your first paragraph, although other scenarios are possible. But you must make sure your thesis is easily identifiable, plausible, novel, sophisticated, insightful, and absolutely clear (see “Grading Procedures,” below).

For the site museum option, **a sample thesis statement** may look like the following:

A modular site museum at Etlatongo would succeed in incorporating many elements of the community into the project by its physical dispersal and would reflect an underlying post-processual epistemology of incorporating many voices, but would not totally abrogate the archaeologist’s voice (for example, as in critical archaeology), which will be present in the displays as supportive of particular interpretations.

-follow up sentences would flesh out the different validity given to interpretations in post-processualism, versus (for example) processualism and critical archaeology.

Students should write a paper that is **no more than 18 pages** of text, not including bibliographies, figures, and appendices. The paper will use 12 point font, regular margins, and be double spaced.

## 2) Sources and Quotations:

As this is a research project, you **must** have extensive in-text citations!

For either option, **12 resources beyond** class readings are necessary. Websites do not count as sources, except for academic journals and other similar resources available on-line, which you would cite as a journal, not a website.

I caution you strongly against large block quotations. Long quotations should be indented and single spaced. In general, use direct quotations within your text sparingly; do not present a paper where much of the text simply repeats other scholars’ contributions.

As students in this class come from different backgrounds, I do not dictate that you follow a specific bibliographic format, as long as you are consistent. Citations must be made **within the text**, not at the end of the text as footnotes or endnotes. For example:

- a) Hodder (2006:35) argues that the specific lack of leopard remains shows their symbolic importance. OR:
- b) The lack of leopard remains has been cited as evidence for their symbolic importance (Hodder 2006:35).

You may certainly include brief footnotes/endnotes in order to explain something, but do not use footnotes for your references.

### **3) The Way in Which Letter Grades Will Be Assigned**

#### *Excellent Paper (A/A-)*

Thesis: Easily identifiable, plausible, novel, sophisticated, clear.

Structure: Evident, understandable, and appropriate for thesis. Excellent transitions from point to point. Paragraphs support solid topic sentences.

Analysis: Clearly relates evidence to thesis; analysis of core concepts is exciting, posing new ways to think about course material.

Logic and argumentation: Shows strong command of underlying course concepts. All ideas in the paper should flow logically; the argument is identifiable, reasonable, and sound.

Counterarguments are acknowledged and where possible, briefly refuted.

Mechanics: Sentence structure, grammar, and diction excellent; correct use of punctuation and citation style; minimal to no spelling errors; absolutely no run-on sentences or awkward constructions.

#### *Good Paper (B+/B/B-)*

Thesis: Promising, but may be slightly unclear, or lacking in insight or originality.

Structure: Generally clear and appropriate, though may wander occasionally. May have a few unclear transitions, or a few paragraphs without strong topic sentences.

Analysis: Critical analysis and evidence often related to thesis, though links not always clear.

Logic and argumentation: Shows solid command of course concepts. Argument of paper is clear, usually flows logically and makes sense. Some evidence that counter-arguments acknowledged, though not addressed with sufficient rigor.

Mechanics: Sentence structure, grammar, and diction strong despite occasional lapses; punctuation and citation style often used correctly. Some (minor) spelling errors; may have some run-on sentences, sentence fragments, or other awkward constructions.

#### *Adequate Paper (C+/C/C-)*

Thesis: May be unclear (contain vague terms), appear unoriginal, or offer relatively little that is new; provides little around which to structure the paper.

Structure: Generally unclear, often wanders or jumps around. Few or weak transitions, many paragraphs without topic sentences.

Analysis: Points often lack supporting evidence, or evidence used where inappropriate (often because there may be no clear point). Quotations or description appear often without critical analysis relating them to thesis (or there is a weak thesis to support), or analysis offers nothing beyond the quotation.

Logic and argumentation: Logic may often fail, or argument may often be unclear. May not address counter-arguments. May contain logical contradictions.

Mechanics: Problems in sentence structure, grammar, and diction (usually not major). Errors in punctuation, citation style, and spelling. May have several run-on sentences or fragments.

*Inadequate Paper (D+/D/D-)*

Thesis: Difficult to identify at all, may be bland restatement of obvious point.

Structure: Unclear because thesis is weak or non-existent. Transitions are confusing and unclear. Few topic sentences.

Analysis: Course concepts are not well understood. Very little or very weak attempt to relate analysis to evidence; may be no identifiable argument, or no evidence to relate it to. General failure to support statements, or evidence seems to support no statement. Little or no use of secondary sources.

Logic and argumentation: Ideas do not flow at all, usually because there is no argument to support. Simplistic view of topic; no effort to grasp possible alternative views. Many logical contradictions, or simply too incoherent to determine.

Mechanics: Large problems in sentence structure, grammar, and diction. Frequent major errors occur in citation style, punctuation, and spelling, and there may be numerous run-on sentences.

*Failing Paper*

Shows minimal effort or comprehension of the assignment.

Very difficult to understand due to major problems with mechanics, structure, and analysis. Has no identifiable thesis or the thesis is incompetent.