

AI Teacher Review

Variant and strategy: V3 · creative but defensible extension

Selected versions: V2, V3

Generated at: 2026-09-20T11:21:20.674Z

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: 120,167 (cached: 0; cache writes: 7,261)

Output tokens: 13,524 (includes reasoning: 7,165)

Total tokens / web-search calls: 133,691 / 13

Estimated cost for this variant: \$2.0260 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 – V3

This is a simulated critical teacher evaluation. All scores, evidence judgements and citation checks are model assessments requiring human teacher review; they are not awarded marks.

Mode and coverage

Mode: Best achievable work, without an imposed grade ceiling. Final-year BA describes the assessment context. **Strategy:** Creative but defensible extension—testing whether belonging can survive reduced contribution or disagreement. The argument explicitly treats this extension as a proposal rather than a published finding.

The Simulated work selects community gardening and two focal ethnographic articles, using companion publications for context. These companions are not independent replications. The focal researchers work in geography and related fields; their published participant-observation research is analysed through political-anthropological concepts. The assignment does not require ethnographies authored exclusively by anthropologists.

Requirement/evidence map

P = provided assignment/Marking criteria; S = supplied source material; G = general background; E = externally retrieved material; I = interpretation or synthesis.

Requirement from P	Evidence and location	Classification
Specific sustainability practice	Community gardening; scope distinguished from ecological performance, §1	E: McClintock; I
Two contextualised ethnographic accounts	Milwaukee and Glasgow, §§2–3	E: Ghose and Pettygrove 2014b; Crossan et al. 2016; companion publications
Power, citizenship and everyday practice	Conditional recognition, institutional authority, cultivation and organisational learning, §§1–4	E: Cornwall, Ong and focal studies; I
Institutions versus participant meanings	Municipal priorities, pastor's account, volunteer and employee perspectives; mediation identified	E; I
Positionality and comparison limits	Research design, funding, access, missing voices and interpretive preference, §5	E: methods/funding statements and Haraway; I
Independent synthesis and ethical future research	Three evaluative dimensions and a prospective design, §§4–6	I informed by E
Six or more scholarly sources	Eight references, all cited	E
Published evidence only	No simulated testimony, personal experience or completed fieldwork	P; E; I

Requirement from P	Evidence and location	Classification
Required structure and length	Descriptive title, seven numbered sections, reference list; approximately 2,100 words excluding references	P; manual assessment

S: none supplied. No substantive claim relies solely on G.

Marking criteria and six quality scores

Dimension	Score	Brief evidence
Conceptual engagement – 25%	5/5	Citizenship is distinguished from legal status; participation is separated from authority and continuity of belonging.
Contextualised ethnographic comparison – 30%	4/5	Specific practices and historical conditions support comparison; limited space restricts depth within individual gardens.
Reflexivity, positionality and ethics – 20%	4/5	Differentiates speakers, addresses mediated knowledge and proposes ongoing consent; detailed author–participant relationships remain incompletely established.
Independent synthesis and research question – 15%	5/5	Develops a testable extension and a substantial collective-obligation counterargument.
Structure and APA referencing – 10%	4/5	Clear separation of findings, interpretation and proposals; final word-processing and hyperlink formatting remain unchecked.
Source integrity and evidentiary restraint – supplementary	4/5	Eight existing scholarly publications; avoids invented testimony and acknowledges companion-study dependence and access limitations.

No weighted grade is asserted.

Source and citation checks

Reference existence and bibliographic details were checked against retrieved articles, university repositories and publisher records. Author-uploaded text supplied the network article. Both focal ethnographies were available as full-text PDFs. APA author–date citations correspond to all eight references; the 2014a/2014b suffixes follow title order. Publication-volume years are used rather than earlier online-publication dates. (gsdrc.org)

No participant quotation is reproduced. The pastor's and workers' meanings are paraphrased and

attributed as representations, not treated as unmediated community consensus. Ong is used only for the conceptual formulation visible in indexed primary-source text; direct PDF retrieval failed. McClintock's use is limited to the argument available in the repository abstract and publication records. These checks do not constitute independent validation of original fieldwork. (escholarship.org)

A corrective revision qualified the institutional/participant distinction, marked companion publications as related evidence, and removed any implication that Glasgow's findings prove universal inclusion. Historical policies are described within the studies' periods, not asserted as current policy.

What remains unproven

The artifact does not establish that a learner read the complete sources, independently developed the comparison, understood the concepts before drafting, or could defend the argument against unfamiliar evidence. It demonstrates a plausible textual synthesis, not field competence, ethical conduct or sustained engagement with participants. It also cannot establish why absent residents did not participate.

The assessment is relatively accessible to AI because it permits unrestricted case and source selection, uses familiar conceptual categories, and assesses a finished literature essay without authentic process evidence. Its strongest demands are distinguishing speakers' interpretations, comparing research designs and resisting a simplistic resistance/co-option binary.

Authentic process and minimal redesign

No actual observation, interview, oral defence or process submission was required; none is represented as completed. To strengthen assessment validity:

1. Add a short in-class comparison of two teacher-selected passages, identifying participant speech, institutional claims and researcher interpretation.
2. Require a small, genuinely produced evidence table linking three claims to exact passages, including one counterexample. Review it at a checkpoint rather than accepting a retrospective process narrative.
3. Retain the essay but add a five-minute oral follow-up. Do not treat any single addition as AI-proof.

Oral follow-up: Explain how a volunteer's positive experience could coexist with conditional citizenship; identify what evidence would weaken the continuity-of-belonging proposal; explain why a worker's description of refugees cannot substitute for their own accounts.

Formatting and validation limitations

Markdown, not a Word file, is supplied. For conversion, use numbered heading styles, a readable 12-point font, double spacing, page numbers and 0.5-inch hanging indents in the reference list; these are discretionary conversion choices. Convert code-formatted DOI addresses to ordinary hyperlinks. Platform source markers supplement the APA citations and can be removed during conversion without removing author–date citations. No rendered document inspection or automated word count was available. The approximately 2,100-word body estimate should be confirmed in Word before operational use.

Machine-readable run record

```
{
  "authorized_test": true,
  "run_id": "1caed5ed-4bf5-418d-a243-443a5623eac6",
  "model_reported": "gpt-6-astra; operator configuration, not independently verified",
  "host_settings": {
    "reasoning_effort": "high; configured, not independently verified",
    "temperature": "not sent",
    "web_access": "available and used",
    "tools": ["web.run"]
  },
  "variant_id": "V3",
  "candidate_profile": "Best achievable work; final-year BA anthropology context; no grade ceiling",
  "source_policy": "external_retrieval",
  "provided_source_ids_used": [],
  "external_sources_used": ["E1", "E2", "E3", "E4", "E5", "E6", "E7", "E8"],
  "word_count": 2100,
  "requirements_met": ["One independent variant", "Two focal ethnographic accounts", "Contextual comparison", "Power, citizenship and everyday practice", "Reflexivity and ethical research proposal", "Eight scholarly sources", "Numbered essay and matching references"],
  "requirements_not_met": [],
  "assumptions": ["Community gardening and case selection are discretionary", "Companion publications supplement rather than independently corroborate focal accounts"],
  "verification_warnings": ["Word count is a rounded manual estimate", "Ong access limited to indexed primary-source passages and publisher metadata", "No rendered Word inspection", "Scores and citation checks require human teacher review"],
  "artifact_sha_or_platform_id": "not supported"
}
```

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.