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| **First Marker Comments:**  Lilly, Meng-Qi and Stephen,  I really liked the topic of the project, and the way you framed the research questions. The presentation was quite eloquent in its framing. The media materials, and the way you linked social media around Aylan Kurdi effectively linked personal experience (highly relevant), knowledge of media, and contemporary social and political life.  I was impressed by the 'keyword' treatment of the research question. That was a promising approach, and highlighted some very relevant theoretical framings. I could see that some of the presentation was being read from a text, which is fine, although perhaps less engaging than speaking directly to the audience.  How did the research design actually work? Your project proposed using four different methods. I could see how the timetable made use of each week of the project to bring together all of these methods. It was quite an ambitious research timetable, but did allow space to try different approaches to the project. It was good to timetable the group meetings – a very practical consideration. I would really have liked to see how the different methods fitted together. **Why use all of these methods? How do those methods address different aspects or keywords in the research question? What different aspects do they show?**  The methods discussion was really effective. It did seem to be doable. I was interested in hearing more about what websites you would choose to analyse in greater depth. **Which ones would you examine?** I was also interested in how you planned to **analyse the documentary video? How does that connect to social media?**  The two theories you propose to use – Gramsci's hegemony and Olin Wright on utopias – seem fine, although the presentation did not map very closely how you would bring them to bear on the different empirical materials  Good team work in the presentation. Presentation was nicely designed visually and well-timed. Remember to look at the audience, all of you!  Questions from the audience – why different methods? Limits of the study? These were handled quite well, I think. | | | |