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| **Marker Comments**  **Compliance & Presentation**  *Does this assignment follow the requirements?*  *Is the assignment correct in format?*  *Is the assignment presented in a clean fashion?*  *Are concepts from the course applied?*  **Research Quality & Sources**  *What is the academic rigor of this assignment?*  *Does the assignment have adequate sources?*  *Are concepts from the course applied correctly?*  **Writing Quality**  *Does this assignment use proper grammar & punctuation?*  *Is the writing strong, active, and interesting?*  *Are sentences concise and clear?*  *Does the assignment flow through proper transitions?*  **Argument**  *Are the arguments clearly stated?*  *Are the arguments sound and focused?*  *Does the evidence provided support the arguments?*  *Are the arguments conceptually based?*  **Analysis of Method**  *Is the analysis analytical rather than descriptive?*  *Does the analysis utilize appropriate scholarship?*  *How well does the analysis capture the literature?*  *Does the analysis contribute to future research?*  *Are concepts from the course explicated throughout?* | **The paper does not conform to the standards described, as much of it is in list or bullet forms, and it is not in the narrative format. How come? It is also unclear which and whose version of feminism you are using. Lastly, there is not much here that indicates how and why you used the methods and what standards are used.**  **Per above, the citations are sparse in-text, and one is not aware of the approaches and rationalizations for the theory and the method.**  **Much proofreading is needed for this paper. It also does not follow from one section to another in a narrative.**  **The arguments here are made without a clear understanding of the methodological rigor to get there. For instance, there is no justification for why you interviewed friends, nor is there a discussion of what consequences there might be methodologically.**  **Data are not clearly explained or explicated, so it seems sometimes what you are saying comes from your understandings of previous research or the information from your participants. It is also confusing the organization of the paper, which limits the ability of method to come through.** |
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