Politics 326(W) Globalization and Equity
Spring 2016
Tuesdays and Thursdays 9:40-11:10 a.m. – WLT231

Prof. Greg Felker
Office: Smullin 333
Office Tel. 503-370-6261
E-mail: gfelker@willamette.edu
Office Hours: Mondays 3-4:30 p.m., Thursdays 4-5 p.m., or any time by appointment (recommended)

Course Description
This course explores globalization, a process that some observers claim is radically transforming global, national, and local politics, economics, and culture. Others argue that globalization is nothing new, but simply the latest phase in long-term trends. Still others dismiss the entire notion that globalization is a distinct phenomenon, and claim that it is simply an unclear label used to describe many different processes and outcomes, or else simply an ideological language used to conceal specific political agendas and actions. In short, globalization is a concept that is widely used but inadequately defined and therefore often poorly understood.

The course looks at the areas of production and consumption, finance, employment and income distribution. It also investigates issues of state power, national sovereignty, cultural change, and patterns of adaptation and resistance. Special emphasis is placed on the analytical relationships between globalization and democracy, equity, and inequality. While our emphasis is on the politics of globalization, our materials are cross-disciplinary, and draw on international and comparative political economy, as well as historical political sociology and anthropology.

Student Learning Objectives - The goals or student learning objectives of the course include enabling students to:
- Exercise general academic skills as applied to the course topics
  - read carefully
  - research effectively
  - speak competently
  - think critically and broadly without losing attention to specificity
  - write persuasively
- In particular, demonstrate mastery of analytic / persuasive writing according to academic / professional norms:
  - Responds appropriately to the specified topic;
  - Advances a thesis with sustained focus and conveys a debate with an alternative explanation(s);
  - Provides appropriate evidence, reflecting a reasonably comprehensive research effort;
  - Organizes material effectively into a structure easily apprehended by a reader;
  - Uses appropriate style and mechanics
- Acquire specific knowledge of the key concepts and debates about globalization, and be able to apply them
  - understand different analytical frameworks for explaining globalization and its key institutions and processes;
  - evaluate competing claims about globalization’s consequences for human societies.
  - critically assess arguments for and against the notion that contemporary globalization is a distinct form or historical phase of the world’s political history;
  - analyze the ways in which globalization has become a crucial element of political debate, contestation, and mobilization around the world

Writing centered
POLI326(W) is a writing-centered course. This entails several components: a process of drafting and revising papers with instructor feedback; peer review and comment; and informal or in-class writing. We will devote some class time to these activities, and three class sessions will be set aside for individual writing conferences, so that I will meet individually with every class member on at least one of their papers. Of course, you are encouraged to meet with me individually at other times, during office hours or by appointment. Also, please use the Writing Center – it is a matchless resource for improving your writing. Meanwhile, here is one crucial point for you to keep in mind: do not wait passively for my feedback on proposals or drafts before you continue working on your writing assignments. Carry on with your writing work, and incorporate my feedback along the way.
Course materials
The following books are available for purchase in the campus bookstore. Other readings will be available on WISE under the Resources tab and on the Schedule on the relevant date entries. Also, students are expected to follow global developments by reading mainstream and alternative news sources.


Course format, assignments and assessment
The course is primarily organized around class discussion and writing assignments that draw on careful reading of the assigned texts. Lectures are infrequent and are aimed primarily at framing the context or background for the readings. Students are expected to have read all of the required materials in advance of each seminar and be fully prepared to participate in discussions of the assigned readings. Participating in discussions involves not only commenting on the readings, but raising relevant questions.

**Participation - 15%:** A seminar is a wonderful opportunity for learning, yet it depends crucially on student attendance and participation. Attendance is necessary but not sufficient for a good participation grade; I reserve the right to deduct points for multiple absences. You are expected to read the materials in advance of each class and be prepared to engage in a detailed discussion of the readings. Your grade here will be based on your attendance and attentiveness; the quality of your contributions in the class; your willingness to give serious consideration to your peers' ideas and opinions; and occasional in-class writing.

**Presentation – 10%:** You will give a presentation on the research you have done for your final case-study research-based paper. We will hold presentations during the last three class sessions.

**Writing portfolio – 75%:** Over the course of the semester, you will compile a writing portfolio via WISE Assignments, including assignments, all of your formal writing (drafts and final versions), along with assignments and comments from peers and the instructor. Descriptions of and instructions for each of the writing assignments are found at the end of this syllabus.

Informal writing assignments (part of participation, but please include in portfolio).

**Paper #1 Critique Essay – 15%**

**Paper #2 Thematic Essay – 25%**

**Paper #3 Research Paper – 35%**

We will use the WISE Assignment tool to make submissions and transmit feedback. Assignments are due by 5 p.m. on the due-date. *If you do not receive an automated e-mail confirmation from WISE, double-check your submission and upload it again.* Late submissions will be deducted one-third grade penalty per day (e.g. a B+ paper handed in a day late receives a B, two days late a B-, etc.). Detailed instructions can be found later in the syllabus.

Key Expectations and Commitments:

**Enthusiastic and Respectful Participation:** Your genuine effort to prepare and contribute to class discussion will be the key to the course’s success or failure. Don’t be shy! Even if your thought is half-formed, try to jot it down and then speak up to explain it to your peers. Help each other identify key points of debate and clarify any points of confusion. Ask questions about anything that seems unclear or confusing in the readings or discussion. I will occasionally give mini-lectures to frame topics, but do not wait for my “approval” to speak up and contribute your thoughts and reactions to the issues discussed in the readings. Please debate ideas in the readings and discussion – you are encouraged to debate vigorously, feel free to disagree, but non-personally, with each other and with me. Please do not whisper or talk privately while in the classroom – it’s disrespectful to the speaker. Likewise, do not text, check e-mail, or surf the web for anything other than material directly class-related (and then only when absolutely necessary). You will also be asked to lead discussion in turn, by responding to questions on readings.
Attendance is required. A seminar depends crucially on student attendance and engagement in discussion. You are expected to read the materials in advance of each class and be prepared to engage in a detailed discussion of the readings. Your grade here will be based on your attendance and attentiveness; the quality of your contributions in the class; your willingness to give serious consideration to your peers’ ideas and opinions. It will also include occasional turns leading discussion and occasional in-class writing. More than two absences will result in points lost from the participation component of the course. These two are like “sick days” given in a professional / work environment; they include “excused” absences for athletics, debate, as well as genuine illness.

Academic Honor Code & (non-) Plagiarism:  
http://www.willamette.edu/cla/dean/ethic/index.html  
“We will hold ourselves to the highest standards of moral, academic excellence. We will proudly submit only our original work. We will never attempt to give ourselves or others an unfair advantage. We will commit to upholding our honor and the value of our work. Through this commitment we will serve as an example of our peers.” If you’re unsure of what plagiarism means or entails, please familiarize yourself with Willamette’s plagiarism policy, which you can find at http://www.willamette.edu/cla/catalog/archive/2003/resources/policies/plagiarism_cheating/index.php. Plagiarism is an extremely serious offense against academic integrity, and will not be tolerated, but referred to the College for sanction. Be sure to credit and cite properly all sources in all your writing and presentations. If you wish to have a refresher / review of the standards of academic originality, norms of citation, ways of avoiding plagiarism, please let me know. There are different sorts of plagiarism, including failing to use quotation marks when quoting another author’s text, or failing to cite (give credit to a source) for specific points of data or argument. Some students profess to be confused about the difference between legitimate paraphrasing and plagiarism. Two pieces of simple advice, if followed, can eliminate any confusion: a) when in doubt, quote / cite; b) simply remember that when the instructor (or anyone else) reads your written work, it must be you who is “speaking” to him/her through the words on the page. Make sure your writing is always a statement in/of your own thoughts expressed in your own voice, even when you are speaking about, or reflecting on, others’ ideas.

Diversity: In pursuit of the goal of academic excellence, I seek to develop and nurture diversity, believing that it strengthens classroom engagement, stimulates creativity, promotes the exchange of ideas, and enriches campus life. I do not condone discrimination against any member of the school’s community on the basis of race, religion, color, sex, age, national origin or ancestry, marital status, parental status, gender identity, sexual orientation, ability status, health status, or veteran status. As such I strive to make the classroom a space where all participants are treated with respect and equity. I welcome your ideas and suggestions about how to improve the creation of such an inclusive learning community.

Accommodations: If you have particular learning needs, medical conditions, or disabilities that require accommodation in order for you to perform up to your potential, please inform me at the beginning of the semester, and make an appointment with the Bishop Wellness Center’s Disability and Learning Services staff. Accommodation will gladly be made according to their instructions, but only if notice is given in advance. Likewise with necessary absences for religious observances: you must notify me in advance.

Two-way feedback: I will do my best to provide quality feedback on your work in the class. Sometimes, the quality of feedback is a trade-off with the speed of returning comments to you. My general standard is one-two weeks. Meanwhile, again, do not wait for my feedback to begin on your next assignments. If you are ever concerned or upset about anything in the class, please come see me during office hours or make an appointment. I will do my best to address your concerns or respond to your suggestions, but you must let me know that there is an issue of concern. I want this class to be the best learning experience it can possibly be; that can only happen if you and I invest our best efforts and give each other feedback.
I. Conceptualizing Globalization

January 19
- Hebron & Stack (henceforth “H&S”) *Globalization 2nd ed.* “Ch. 1 Globalization in the Twenty-First Century”

January 21
- H&S *Globalization* Ch. 2 “Conceptual Perspectives on Globalization”
- Micklethwait and Wooldridge “The Hidden Promise: Liberty Renewed” Ch. 1 in L&B
- Sen “How to Judge Globalism” Ch. 2 in L&B
- Hamelink “The Elusive Concept of Globalisation” Ch. 3 in L&B

January 26
- Meyer, et al., “World Society and the Nation-State” Ch. 9 in L&B
- Wallerstein “The Modern World-System as a Capitalist World-Economy” Ch. 6 in L&B
- Sklair “Sociology of the Global System” Ch. 7 in L&B
- Appadurai “Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy” in L&B

II. Economic Globalization

January 28 [Last day for ADD/DROP is Jan. 29]
- H&S Ch. 3 “Market Integration”
- Stiglitz “Globalism’s Discontents” Ch. 27 in L&B

February 2
- H&S Ch. 4 “Growth and Development”
- Korzeniewicz “Commodity Chains and Marketing Strategies: Nike and the Global Athletic Footwear Industry” Ch. 20 in L&B
- Gereffi “The Global Economy, Organization, Governance, and Development” Ch. 21 in L&B

February 4
- Wolf “Incensed About Inequality” from L&B 4th edition [on WISE]
- Milanovic “Global Income Inequality by the Numbers: In History and Now: An Overview” Ch. 23 in L&B
- Bourguignon “Inequality and Globalization: How the Rich Get Richer as the Poor Catch Up” *Foreign Affairs* January/February 2016 [on WISE]
- Rodrik “Has Globalization Gone Too Far?” Ch. 30 in L&B
- Glenn “Welfare Spending in an Era of Globalization” Ch. 31 in L&B

III. Political Globalization – Global System, Global Governance, Global Civil Society

February 9
- L&B “Introduction” pp. 266-269
- H&S Ch. 5 “Democratization”
- Strange “The Declining Authority of States” Ch. 28 in L&B
- Mittelman “Global Organized Crime” Ch. 29 in L&B

February 11
- H&S Ch. 6 “Sovereignty”
- Slaughter “A New World Order” Ch. 35 in L&B
- Vreeland “The International Monetary Fund” Ch. 33 in L&B
- Capling & Higgott “The Future of the Multilateral Trade System – What Role for the WTO?” Ch. 34 in L&B
February 16
- Utting, Peter “CSR and Equality” 2007 Third World Quarterly 28(4): 697-712 (on WISE)
- Bieri and Boli “Trading Diamonds Responsibly: Institutional Explanations for Corporate Social Responsibility” Ch. 44 in L&B
- [TBA: perhaps Rhys or one of the other global CSR articles]

February 18
- Blundell, S. The No-Nonsense Guide to Fair Trade Ch. 2 “The revolution that went to market” (on WISE)

February 23
- L&B “Introduction” pp. 310-13
- Boli & Thomas “World Culture in the World Polity: A Century of International Non-Governmental Organization” Ch. 42 in L&B
- Bond “The Backlash against NGOs” in L&B 4th ed. [on WISE]

February 25 [Last day to elect C/NC grading basis is Feb. 26]
- Levitt “The Transnational Villagers” Ch. 15 in L&B
- Roy “Poverty Capital: Microfinance and the Making of Development” Ch. 45 in L&B
- Berkovitch “The Emergence and Transformation of the International Women’s Movement” Ch. 39 in L&B
- Heger Boyle “The Evolution of Debates over Female Genital Cutting” Ch. 40 in L&B

IV. Cultural Globalization – Imperialism, Alterity, Hybridity / Glocalism
March 1
- H&S “Ch. 7 Culture”
- Bestor “How Sushi Went Global” Ch. 13 in L&B
- Watson “McDonald’s in Hong Kong” Ch. 14 in L&B

March 3
- L&B “Introduction” pp. 362-65
- Tomlinson “Cultural Imperialism” Ch. 46 in L&B
- Kishan Thussu “Mapping Global Media Flow and Contra-Flow” Ch. 47 in L&B
- Shim “Hybridity and the Rise of Korean Popular Culture” Ch. 48 in L&B

March 8
- Roscoe “Watching Big Brother at Work” Ch. 49 in L&B
- Tyrrell “Bollywood versus Hollywood: Battle of the Dream Factories” Ch. 50 in L&B
- Cowen “Why Hollywood Rules the World, and Whether We Should Care” Ch. 51 in L&B
- Goldblatt “The Great Game and the Informal Empire” Ch. 16 in L&B
- Lechner “Orange Nation: Soccer and National Identity in the Netherlands” Ch. 61 in L&B

March 10
- L&B “Introduction” pp. 414-17
- Kurzman “Bin Laden and Other Thoroughly Modern Muslims” Ch. 52 in L&B
- Jenkins “The Christian Revolution” Ch. 54 in L&B
- Yates “American Evangelicals: the Overlooked Globalizers and Their Unintended Gospel of Modernity” Ch. 55 in L&B
- Lechner “Religious Rejections of Globalization” Ch. 57 in L&B
V. Globalization, Security, and Environment

March 15
- Held & McGrew Globalization / Anti-Globalization Ch. 4 “Global Insecurities: Military Threats and Environmental Catastrophe” pp. 43-64 (on WISE)
- Huntington “The Clash of Civilizations?” Ch. 5 in L&B
- Barber “Jihad vs. McWorld” Ch. 4 in L&B

March 17

March 29
- L&B “Introduction” pp. 498-501
- L&S Ch. 8 “The Environment”

March 31
- Wapner “Greenpeace and Political Globalism” Ch. 64 in L&B
- Keck and Sikkink “Environmental Advocacy Networks” Ch. 65 in L&B
- Khagram “Toward Democratic Governance for Sustainable Development: Transnational Civil Society Organizing around Big Dams” Ch. 66 in L&B
- Chasek, et al “Ozone Depletion” Ch. 67 in L&B
- Tamm Hallstrom and Bostrom “Forest Stewardship Council” Ch. 68 in L&B

VI. Remaking Globalization – The Politics of Resistance, Crisis, and Alter-Globalization

April 5 (also, the last day to Withdraw from a course)
- Evans “Counterhegemonic Globalization: Transnational Social Movements in the Contemporary Political Economy” Ch. 70 in L&B
- Pleyers “The Global Justice Movement” Ch. 71 in L&B
- Subcomandante Marcos “Tomorrow Begins Today” Ch. 74 in L&B
- Shiva “Ecological Balance in an Era of Globalization” Ch. 73 in L&B

April 7

April 12

April 14
- World Social Forum “Porto Allegre Call for Mobilization” Ch. 75 in L&B

April 19
- International Forum on Globalization “A Better World is Possible” Ch. 71 in L&B
April 21
- L&S Ch. 9 “Globalization for All?”
- Altman, Roger “Globalization in Retreat” in Foreign Affairs Jul/Aug 2009 (on WISE)
- Naim, Moises “Globalization: Think Again” in Foreign Policy (on WISE)

April 26
Student presentations

April 28
Student presentations

May 3
Student presentations

May 9 – Final Paper due, on WISE, by 5 p.m.
POLI326W – Globalization and Equity

Critique Essay - Guidelines

1650-2200 words. Please include a word count at the end of your paper, and be sure to insert page numbers.

Goal: to prompt both reflection and development of critical thoughts about one of the topics and at least two of the readings covered in the first part of the course.

Due dates:

a) Feb. 5 “nutshell” proposal due – one paragraph identifying what readings you will critique, and what broad question or issue you will focus on in comparing or relating the readings, and a (one or two-sentence) working hypothesis or possible argument. In other words, give your plan for the paper “in a nutshell”. You are not locked in to this; you can modify it as you draft your paper.

b) Feb. 15 draft essay due – a good working draft of your essay, as complete as possible, upload to WISE by 5 p.m., e-mail to peer reviewer. Note that the draft will count separately. The final essay grade will be a weighted average of 10% for the draft and 90% for final version.

c) Feb. 29 revised essay due – upload to WISE. Note that the revised version is graded at a higher standard than the draft. If you return the same work, or make only minimal improvements, the grade might be lower than the draft. Earning a higher grade would require substantial improvements in persuasiveness, structure / organization, composition, support, etc.

Minimum requirements:

- compare / contrast / critique two, three, or four readings covered in the course in the first course units.
- demonstrate an understanding of the concepts and arguments or positions contained in those readings
- present some critique or argument about the similarity and differences among the readings; their persuasiveness, plausibility, consistency; their primary implications. Does one reading raise puzzles that another solves? Does one reading offer an argument that undermines another? What themes do they have in common? How would you go about relating or reconciling them to each other, or do have incompatible assumptions? Which argument is most persuasive, and why? Etc.

Grading criteria

a) thesis (Does the paper identify an interesting question and clear thesis relevant to the question? In this case, the question may be a restatement or specification of a question the author(s) are addressing, rather than a wholly original question, as in a research paper);

b) analysis (Does the essay make points logically related to and supporting the thesis? Does it accurately identity and evaluate the key concepts and arguments in the readings being reviewed? Does it consider alternate arguments or logical steps in an overall argument, so that the thesis is persuasive?);

c) structure / organization (Is there a clear, logical order to the paragraphs? Are their topics clear to the reader and the information within them consistent with each topic? Are there clear topic and transition sentences?);

d) support (Does the essay support its thesis and sub-points with relevant citations from the readings?);

e) composition - grammar, spelling, style (Does the paper contain very few errors in spelling or grammar, or awkward sentences or phrasings? Does it read smoothly?).

Editing / feedback

- We will do peer-editing or response on the essays.
- I will provide verbal or written feedback on the essay draft.
Advice (for you to take or leave, to the degree you find helpful)

- Work back from a thesis/argument to a question, and then forward again. Identify the reading, and the idea or argument, that you find most interesting, believable, crazy or provocative. Then, imagine: i) what might be the counter-argument or idea, and which of our authors comes closest to that counter-argument; ii) what question or puzzle could the idea or argument be the answer to – if this is the answer, what’s the question? Then, look at the question or argument you’ve identified, and answer it yourself. Does your “take” on that debate or question correspond exactly to the original passage or reading that you started with? Or do you see an alternate / modified thesis or argument as being more persuasive?

- Once you identify two or more authors that you see are discussing related ideas from differing viewpoints (or making different arguments, or drawing different conclusions), try to outline their arguments side-by-side. Why do they come to different conclusions about similar questions? Are these authors using the same concepts / definitions, or how do they differ? Do the differences in definitions of key concepts lead to their differing conclusions?

- When you’ve outlined their arguments and examined their points of difference, ask yourself which author seems to have a clearer or more persuasive case. You can reflect on your own ideas and experiences. But also think about it from this standpoint: if the two authors were “products”, and your job was to “sell” them, or persuade people to agree to their argument, which one would you rather try to sell to the public? Why? Jot down the thoughts that come into your head in response, and use them in your essay, as part of your thesis or concluding sections.
POLI326(W) Globalization and Equity

Thematic Essay - Guidelines

2200 words – 1900-2500 acceptable. Please include a word count at the end of your paper, and be sure to insert page numbers.

Goal: to develop a coherent argument on a theme or question that you have noticed running through the course in more than one unit, drawing on any and all relevant readings or parts of readings. Identify a theme or issue, then the alternative perspectives on, or arguments about, that issue offered by different authors. Which perspective or argument is most persuasive, and why? What can we learn about that issue / theme by tracing it through different readings in different units?

Schedule

- March 14 draft due – a good working draft of your essay, as complete as possible (note that the draft will count separately. The draft will not be given a separate grade or weighted portion in the assignment grade. However, lack of a draft will result in two letter grade deduction from the final assignment grade; an incomplete draft will result in a point deduction from the final assignment grade. Upload to WISE by 5:00 p.m. Send to peer reviewer.

- April 4 revised paper due - upload to WISE by 5 p.m. Note that the revised version is graded at a higher standard than the draft. If you return the same work, or make only minimal improvements, the grade might be lower than the draft. Earning a higher grade would require substantial improvements in persuasiveness, structure / organization, composition, support, etc.

Grading criteria

a) thesis (Does the paper identify an interesting question and clear thesis relevant to the question? In this case, the question may be a restatement or specification of a question the author(s) are addressing, rather than a wholly original question, as in a research paper);

b) analysis (Does the essay make points logically related to and supporting the thesis? Does it accurately identity and evaluate the key concepts and arguments in the readings being reviewed? Does it consider alternate arguments or logical steps in an overall argument, so that the thesis is persuasive?);

c) structure / organization (Is there a clear, logical order to the paragraphs? Are their topics clear to the reader and the information within them consistent with each topic? Are there clear topic and transition sentences?);

d) support (Does the essay support its thesis and sub-points with relevant citations from the readings?);

e) composition - grammar, spelling, style (Does the paper contain very few errors in spelling or grammar, or awkward sentences or phrasings? Does it read smoothly?).
Case-Study Research-Based Essay - Guidelines

2900 words – 2600-3500 acceptable. Please include a word count at the end of your paper, and be sure to insert page numbers.

Schedule:
- April 25 – submit a draft of the paper, uploaded to WISE Assignments; e-mail to peer reviewer. If no draft is submitted, final paper is deducted two letter grades. If a partial draft is submitted, final paper is deducted one letter grade
- May 9 -- paper due by 5 p.m. uploaded to WISE.

Goal: to test the usefulness of one or more of the theories or debates in the course on an empirical question. Theories are intrinsically interesting. Yet we should also “take them out for a drive” to see if they work, and whether, in turn, interesting empirical situations or phenomena might suggest changes to theories or resolutions to debates. We want both to test concepts and also to understand them better by using them to shed light on specific issues, cases, examples, or problems in the “real world”.

a) think about which topic in the course interests you most; b) ask yourself what is most intriguing or interesting about that topic; c) think about what real-world example might allow you to apply the theories we read and discussed in that topic. The key is to relate a specific case, with its details, to specific concepts, claims, and debates in the course.

As you plan, propose, draft, and rewrite your paper, keep in mind the need to address these questions: a) which specific (narrow or broad) course debate, theory, or concept are you applying in this paper?; b) why is this topic / case study / issue a good illustration or test of that theory or debate?; c) in what specific ways / aspects does this real-world study confirm and challenge the theory or debate?; d) what is the lesson that this real-world example teaches? In other words, what is your sense of how, if at all, the theory or argument in the course should be modified in light of this example?

Sources: a research paper involves gathering and drawing on (but not copying) reliable sources. The guideline for this assignment is to find and use at least four scholarly articles (peer reviewed journals, as indicated by the check-box on most databases), two books or monographs or chapters therefrom, and a reliable web source (not Wikipedia). You may wish to use more.

Please be encouraged to come see me to bounce ideas off of me at any time. It might help you, and I enjoy it.

Grading criteria

f) thesis (Does the paper identify an interesting question and clear thesis relevant to the question? In this case, the question may be a restatement or specification of a question the author(s) are addressing, rather than a wholly original question, as in a research paper?);

g) analysis (Does the essay make points logically related to and supporting the thesis? Does it accurately identify and evaluate the key concepts and arguments in the readings being reviewed? Does it consider alternate arguments or logical steps in an overall argument, so that the thesis is persuasive?);

h) structure / organization (Is there a clear, logical order to the paragraphs? Are their topics clear to the reader and the information within them consistent with each topic? Are there clear topic and transition sentences?);

i) support (Does the essay support its thesis and sub-points with relevant citations from the readings? Does it cite relevant, reliable sources?).

j) composition - grammar, spelling, style (Does the paper contain very few errors in spelling or grammar, or awkward sentences or phrasings? Does it read smoothly?).
Prof. Felker – writing assessment criteria

General criteria: Cogent / consistent / logical / precise analysis, depth - explaining the reasons and logic of the main thesis or argument; support – cites / gives key supporting points, quotations, examples, or other evidence; organization - clearly organized and composed overall, and within each section or paragraph; grammar - few grammatical or spelling errors; style – clear and engaging.

Writing with an “A” grade range has high level of precision conceptually and compositionally; probes / rigorously analyzes the reasons for, and logic of, the main argument; cites the most effective supporting evidence or examples; recognizes and effectively critiques the chief competing arguments; is well and clearly organized; makes few if any errors in grammar and spelling; is rarely if ever ambiguous; and has a distinctly engaging style (crisp, or clear, or fluent, etc.).

Writing with a “B” range grade offers a consistent argument in clear terms; spells out clearly some major reasons for, and/or logic of, that argument or thesis; cites some examples or supporting evidence / quotations; mentions or recognizes some alternate arguments or reasoning; is generally well organized, though in a few places is not entirely clear; has some but not overly distracting grammatical or spelling errors; has a competent style that conveys the writer’s meaning with occasional ambiguity.

Writing with a “C” grade makes some effective points, though some inconsistencies in argument are evident; does not clearly specify or express the reasons for / logic of the main argument; mostly does not recognize any alternate arguments; is not well organized; has numerous grammatical and spelling errors; style is not clear and occasionally distracts the reader from the author’s meaning.

Writing with a “D” grade has some worthy elements, but lacks overall organizational and compositional clarity, has many grammatical errors, or is generally under-developed.

Writing with an “F” grade shows some effort but does not accomplish the assignment goals, perhaps is substantially incomplete, or is not handed in at all.