




Feedback for RRMP Literature Review Summative

| | |
|---|---|
| Tutor completing summative feedback: Karen Outram | Student number: 250378 |
| Details of any extensions etc: | Submission Attempt: First submission Second submission |

| Criteria and weighting | Level | Comments: |
|--|--------------|---|
| Knowledge and understanding of the topic/ issues under consideration (30%) | Very Good | There is evidence of knowledge in regards to your subject matter and it is clear that research has taken place. The content does read more like a report however, than a Literature Review and so please do bear this in mind moving forward. |
| Criticality (30%) | Satisfactory | Currently your writing style is descriptive, you need to develop a more critical approach to your content by applying discussion and comparison in the context. The Literature Review currently is quite one sided. Academic writing needs that debate and discussion applied to give a non-biased even handed account of a topic under discussion |
| Use of relevant sources (20%) | Satisfactory | There is a satisfactory use of research resources. In a Literature Review you are supposed to briefly reflect on what your research methodologies are to set the scene of the discussion. You also need to identify gaps in research that you intend to fill. This is necessary to give the assignment an appropriate rationale and so please bear this in mind moving forward. |
| Structure and Presentation (as detailed in the assessment guidance) (10%) | Very Good | Overall, very good presentation of your assignment document. Just a few minor comments, it is beneficial to add a contents page to your document, and a basic requirement is that you add page numbers to an academic assignment. Moving forward ensure that your 'Reference list' is on its own page at the very bottom of the assignment. Aside from the above, it clear that time and attention have been paid to laying out the assignment to a very good standard, with sub-headers and appropriate length paragraphs in evidence. |
| Academic integrity (10%) | Satisfactory | The assignment is within word count which is good practice. Keep your font consistent. After the sub header: Advantages, the text changes to the font Calibri. Keep your quotes to a minimum and only use the section of the quote that is critical to the underpinning of your discussion. There are also sub-headers in your assignment that act as 'lists' regarding information. Moving forward write in full paragraphs and |



| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | draw discussion out all the way through the assignment, [please see criticality]. There is a concise writing style developing in your content, but it is inclined to be a little descriptive at the moment. |
| Overall | | |
| <u>Positives:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Generally, very good presentation of the document, [with some comments added to consider moving forward]• Overall, very good knowledge demonstrated for the content that was discussed and researched• Overall, a satisfactory outcome | | |
| <u>Points for development:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Research needs to be deeper and more extensive• Please see comments in academic integrity and reflect on these moving forward• Work on your critical writing style, and develop your discussion and debate• For any future literature reviews , ensure you discuss your research intentions, [however briefly] in the assignment. | | |