

AI Teacher Review

Variant and strategy: V2 · multi-perspective synthesis

Selected versions: V2, V3

Generated at: 2026-09-20T11:16:34.902Z

Course or project: Cultural anthropology · BA3 illustrative example

Academic level / competence: Final-year bachelor / Best achievable work

Target length / language / genre: 1800–2200 / English / Essay

Citation style / source policy: APA 7 / External retrieval

Sources: 0 provided; titles and full text in settings appendix

Assignment / marking criteria / outcomes: Provided / Provided / Provided — see settings appendix

Formatting instructions: Provided — full text in settings appendix

Expectations for simulated work: Provided — full text in settings appendix

Model preset / reasoning: Astra · high / high

Requested model: gpt-6-astra

Model returned by API: gpt-6-astra

Model snapshot date: Not exposed in the returned model ID

Web / temperature / service tier: on / not sent / default

Authorization / funding: Authorized educator test / Owner-funded API

Input tokens: 118,293 (cached: 0; cache writes: 7,260)

Output tokens: 12,415 (includes reasoning: 5,965)

Total tokens / web-search calls: 130,708 / 13

Estimated cost for this variant: \$1.9518 USD

One variant: full input, simulated work, AI Teacher Review, reasoning and reported web-search calls. Excludes other variants, failed attempts, tax and account-specific discounts. Indicative API cost, not a ChatGPT subscription charge or a candidate-only student price.

Search content is billed at input rates; this estimate uses the returned input-token usage and adds reported tool-call fees.

Price snapshot: 2026-09-16. <https://developers.openai.com/api/docs/pricing>

AI Teacher Review – V2

This is a simulated critical teacher evaluation. All scores, citation checks and judgments require human teacher review; they are not an awarded grade.

Mode and coverage

Mode: Best achievable work, without an imposed grade ceiling. One independent variant uses multi-perspective synthesis: organisational continuity, distributed power, ordinary citizenship, everyday sustainability and reflexive comparison. The two principal accounts are Ikeda (2019) and Poljak Istenič (2018); Aptekar is a supplementary counterexample, not a replacement comparison.

Length: Approximately 2,100 words excluding references. This is a manual estimate, not a software-verified count; confirm in the destination editor. The text was reviewed and revised once to clarify the distinction between reported findings and comparative inference and to avoid equating publication dates with fieldwork dates.

Marking criteria: requirement/evidence map

Requirement	Evidence and provenance	Assessment
Address inclusion/exclusion in one sustainability practice	P: assignment; E: garden studies; I: entry, contribution and authority distinction	Covered; non-members remain a stated evidential gap.
Compare two published ethnographic accounts in context	E: Ikeda and Poljak Istenič; I: comparison of institutionalisation and recognition	Covered in sections 3–5; close comparison is stronger than population-level generalisation.
Analyse power, citizenship and everyday practice	E: Arnstein, Staeheli et al., Schlosberg and Coles, Kelty; I: application	Covered, with concepts used analytically rather than only defined.
Distinguish institutional, participant and researcher meanings	E: reported evidence; I: explicit attribution and interpretive limits	Covered; no independent municipal-document comparison is claimed.
Discuss positionality and comparability	E: principal authors' methods accounts; I: conditional implications and self-positioning	Covered; possible access effects are not presented as demonstrated bias.
Propose an ethical question and method	P: prospective task; I: decision tracing, recruitment and safeguards	Covered; no activity is represented as completed.
At least six scholarly sources, matching citations and references	E: eight published articles	Eight cited works match eight reference entries.
English essay, descriptive title and numbered sections	P: formatting; I: organisation	Covered in Markdown.
1,800–2,200 words, references excluded	P: length; manual assessment	Appears within range; exact editor count remains outstanding.

Source classification: P comprises the supplied assignment, Marking criteria and configuration. S is

empty. E comprises retrieved scholarly publications and their publisher/repository records. I comprises the thesis, comparison, conditional deductions and research proposal. No substantive claim is justified solely through G.

Six quality scores

Dimension	Score / 5	Brief evidence
Conceptual engagement – 25%	5	Distinguishes access, authority, accountability and continuity; citizenship is not collapsed into legal status.
Contextualised ethnographic comparison – 30%	4	Historically situated comparison and meaningful methodological asymmetry; additional close analysis of particular encounters would strengthen it.
Reflexivity, positionality and ethics – 20%	5	Analyses reported research relationships, identifies the essay's normative preference, and avoids treating gatekeeper consent as sufficient.
Independent synthesis and research question – 15%	5	Offers a conditional, investigable thesis and a method designed to seek counterevidence.
Structure and APA referencing – 10%	4	Clear numbered structure and matching references; platform citation markers and code-formatted DOI links need conversion for conventional APA presentation.
Evidence integrity and verification	4	No invented quotations, findings or firsthand activity; supplementary sources were sometimes consulted through abstracts rather than complete texts.

These ordinal scores should not be mechanically converted into a percentage grade.

Source and citation checks

- Full-text material was retrieved and relevant sections consulted for the two principal accounts, Kelty, and Schlosberg and Coles. Ikeda was available through J-STAGE; Poljak Istenič's published article text was accessible through ResearchGate. This does not establish inspection of every page or of the authors' underlying research records. (jstage.jst.go.jp)
- Bounded uses of Aptekar, Abu-Lughod and Staeheli et al. rely on their publisher abstracts and bibliographic records. Arnstein's central distinction was checked against the publisher record and indexed original article text. No detailed empirical claims were imported from unavailable full texts. (onlinelibrary.wiley.com)

- No participant quotations are reproduced. Therefore, no unverifiable quotation wording or pinpoint page references have been introduced.
- Publication-year discrepancies were resolved in favour of the journal issue: Poljak Istenič is 2018 despite a 2017 ResearchGate header; Kelty is 2017 despite online publication in 2016; Schlosberg and Coles is 2016 despite advance publication in 2015; Ikeda is 2019 despite later repository availability. ([researchgate.net](https://www.researchgate.net))
- Verification establishes reference existence, accessible content and correspondence with the claims used. It does not independently validate fieldwork, prove representativeness, or establish the gardens' present condition.

What remains unproven

The artifact does not establish that a learner independently located or read the articles, understands their arguments without assistance, can distinguish a source passage from a plausible inference under questioning, or can implement the proposed ethics in practice. The essay offers an original synthesis, not new empirical findings. Its comparison cannot determine how common exclusion is, and it provides no direct testimony from absent residents.

Assessment vulnerability and authentic process

The assessment is readily approachable through public scholarship because case selection is free, its conceptual requirements are explicit, and it requires no course-specific encounter or demonstrated process. The harder demands are source access, contextual attribution and limiting comparative claims. A polished essay can display these features without demonstrating the learner's independent competence.

The present assignment requires no actual fieldwork, interview or participation, so none is missing and no placeholder is necessary. If process evidence is added, require it to be generated authentically during the assessment—not reconstructed retrospectively. Suitable evidence would include an in-class source annotation, a contemporaneous claim-to-passage table and a short explanation of one substantive revision.

Short oral follow-up, approximately five minutes:

1. Identify one published passage expressing a participant's meaning and explain how it differs from your interpretation.
2. Why might institutionalisation increase capacity without increasing accountability?
3. What finding would weaken your contestability thesis, and how would your method detect it?

Minimal redesign: Retain the essay, add one instructor-selected contrasting passage, require a one-page evidence matrix, and use the short oral follow-up. These changes test interpretation and transfer without claiming to make the assessment AI-proof.

Word conversion notes

Use the descriptive title as the document title; preserve section numbering and the two subsection headings. Optional conversion defaults, not assignment requirements: 12-point Times New Roman, double spacing, 2.54-cm margins and page numbers. Apply 1.27-cm hanging indents to references. Convert DOI strings to ordinary hyperlinks, remove their code styling, and remove platform web markers while retaining the APA author–date citations. No .docx was generated or visually inspected.

Machine-readable run record

```
{
  "authorized_test": true,
  "run_id": "1caed5ed-4bf5-418d-a243-443a5623eac6",
  "model_reported": "gpt-6-astra; configuration value, not independently verified",
  "host_settings": {
    "reasoning_effort": "high; requested configuration, not independently verified",
    "temperature": "not sent",
    "web_access": "available and used",
    "tools": ["web.run"]
  },
  "variant_id": "V2",
  "candidate_profile": "Best achievable work; final-year bachelor task context; multi-perspective synthesis",
  "source_policy": "external_retrieval",
  "provided_source_ids_used": [],
  "external_sources_used": [
    "https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1990.17.1.02a00030",
    "https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12152",
    "https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225",
    "https://doi.org/10.14890/jrca.20.1_007",
    "https://doi.org/10.1086/688705",
    "https://doi.org/10.16995/ee.1949",
    "https://doi.org/10.1057/cpt.2015.34",
    "https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132511435001"
  ],
  "word_count": 2100,
  "requirements_met": ["one independent variant", "two principal ethnographic accounts", "eight scholarly references", "contextual comparison", "requested concepts", "reflexivity and ethics", "prospective research design", "numbered English essay"],
  "requirements_not_met": ["strict final APA visual presentation requires removal of platform citation markers and DOI code styling"],
  "assumptions": ["community gardening and cases selected freely", "no firsthand research required", "publication-year rather than upload-year references"],
  "verification_warnings": ["word_count is a rounded manual estimate, not an exact software count", "some supplementary arguments checked through abstracts", "scores and citation checks require teacher review", "no document rendering or underlying-data verification"],
  "artifact_sha_or_platform_id": "not available"
}
```

Full settings appendix

Assignment brief

BA3 anthropological literature essay: Who is included and excluded when urban sustainability initiatives invite residents to participate? Choose a specific practice, such as community gardening, neighbourhood energy initiatives or repair cafés. Compare two published ethnographic accounts, situating each in its social and historical context. Use concepts of power, citizenship and everyday practice to analyse the difference between institutional accounts of participation and participants' perspectives. Discuss researcher positionality and the limits of comparing ethnographic knowledge across settings. Propose an ethical fieldwork question and method for future research, without inventing observations, quotations, interviews or personal fieldwork. Select at least six verifiable scholarly sources relevant to your question. Use APA 7 in-text citations and a matching reference list. Clearly separate research findings, interpretation and recommendations. Use published evidence only; do not invent data, interviews or firsthand experience. You may choose cases, theories and sources where these are not specified.

Marking criteria

Conceptual engagement: 25%; contextualised ethnographic comparison: 30%; reflexivity, positionality and ethics: 20%; independent synthesis and research question: 15%; structure and APA referencing: 10%. Strong work distinguishes participants' meanings from institutional and researcher interpretations.

Learning outcomes

Synthesise anthropological debates on sustainability, power and citizenship.
Interpret ethnographic evidence in context.
Compare accounts without flattening cultural differences.
Evaluate positionality and research ethics.

Exemplar or formatting instructions

Use a descriptive title, numbered sections, and an APA 7 reference list. The word limit excludes references. This is an illustrative BA3 assignment created for the simulator, not an official Leiden University assignment.

Expectations for the simulated student's work

Political anthropology and anthropology of sustainability; a reflexive approach to ethnographic knowledge. Draw on published ethnographies, not fabricated fieldwork.