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| **First Marker Comments:**  Katie, Yaser, Hong, Daphne  Research questions were interesting but slightly problematic in the way that tended to ask whether particular theories were relevant, rather than focusing on the substantive topic. Try to frame question that focuses on something that is observed, lived or controversial.  The presentation of project went smoothly, and effectively used the presentation time, although in some respects it seemed to spend a lot of time on digital ethnography, and spent quite a lot of time explaining theoretical approaches. This was probably not really needed to convey the research design.  In some respects, it was hard to see how the empirical research fitted with some of the theoretical perspectives, and the project in general struck me as slightly dispersed. The proposal for the digital ethnography was interesting, and concretely well thought out, although with them some ethical challenges (e.g. becoming member of closed groups of Facebook). I couldn't quite see how the digital ethnography and the participatory cultures approaches fitted together: were they they same thing?  If the research was carried out in all the proposed forms, it would be a very unusually diverse project. The combination of media effects, Baudrillard on simulation, Fiske on popular culture and Bourdieu's habitus might be hard to bring off.  Question time was handled well, but not all group members were participating here.  Presentation was nicely designed visually. A slight problem with timing, but not too bad. Remember to look at the audience, and not read too much from the slides! | | | |
| **Second Marker Comments:** | | | |