**CC0003 POSTER FEEDBACK FORM**

Please see below for feedback on your poster assignment.

**Student Matriculation Number:** Isaac Goh T93b2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **General: Main Argument, Rebuttal, Counterargument**  Opinions/examples/ summary has been provided in place of main arguments.  Main arguments have been provided in response to the question.  Rebuttals/counter-arguments are often irrelevant/inappropriate.  Rebuttals are fairly well considered/substantiated.  Counter-arguments are fairly well considered/substantiated.  Rebuttals/counter-arguments are relevant and astute and have been robustly supported and developed. | **Development of Argument**  No clear view/position/clear thesis statement was presented in relation to the question.  Some expression of point of view/position/thesis statement, however this could have been more explicitly developed and justified.    Sufficiently clear expression of view/position /thesis statement in relation to the question, that was developed fairly consistently throughout the material.  Mostly clear and coherent view/position/thesis statement was established in relation to the question, and a robust position was consistently presented throughout the material. |
| **Relevance/Addressing the Question**  The material used was not relevant to the question.  The material used was relevant to the topic in a very general way, but did not make clear how it was relevant to the specific question/title.  The material used was relevant to the specific issues that were the focus of the question. | **Supporting your claims/Using Evidence**  Insufficient clear evidence to support claims/assertion/ideas presented in essay.  Some evidence was provided, but explicit links to claims/assertions/ideas could be clearer/developed more.    For the most part, there was relevant and appropriate use of evidence that was clearly and convincingly presented to support the main claims/assertions/ideas presented in the essay. |
| **Organisation & Structure**  Material is not structured in a logical sequence.  For the most part, material was structured in a way that allowed for a logical sequence of ideas.  Material was fairly well-linked and relevantly connected.  Material was mostly coherently and consistently linked throughout. | **Critical Evaluation**  The material presented was largely descriptive – there was not enough assessment of the value or significance of what was described or discussed.    The main evaluative points could be more extensive/explicit/systematic/reasoned/justified.      Fairly systematic, reasoned and justified assessments of value were made in the essay. |
| **Use of Language**  Material has too many spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors.  The language used in the essay made the views/positions expressed unclear or difficult to follow.  The meaning of views/positions expressed was clear, but the language is too colloquial.  The writing style is mostly fluent, clear and the tone is appropriate.  The writing style and use of language are excellent. | **Referencing/Citations**  No references were used in the essay to support views/positions presented.  Irrelevant or inappropriate references were used to support views/positions presented in the essay.  Relevant and appropriate references were used to support the views/positions presented in the essay.  The wrong citation conventions were used/used inaccurately.  There were no citations. |

General Comments:

For the most part, this is a competent response to the question. The main argument could provide a reference to Kantian ethics and the emphasis on moral duty. The rebuttal’s points about governments taking the initiative in boycotts overlooks the fact that there have been bills passed to boycott certain suppliers through import bans (eg. The USA’s ban on Xinjiang Cotton, seafood caught by slaves and the ban on latex gloves from Malaysian manufacturer Top Glove).