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| **First Marker Comments:**  Cher, Beckie, Steve, Pingke  The project was nicely introduced and framed by the slides. The research questions were quite complicated, but I think well-defined. The first one was particularly dense, and may involved a couple of separate issues. The idea of bringing together the post-feminist approa  The academic literature framing was really comprehensive and critically aware. It was probably slightly too much to digest in a project of this scale, but great to see it all there. It also embodied the research design. The timetable of research was good in its concrete detail, but less effective in highlighting how the research would address the research question. The discussion of sample methods was ok, but (1) quite conventional; (2) hard to see the research questions were addressed. It would be good to have seen some sample analyses that focused more directly on the challenges of the research questions (e.g. post-feminism in contemporary textual-visual environments).  Good team work in the presentation. Presentation was nicely designed visually. Remember to look at the audience!  Did audience actually use the term 'post-feminist'? How do you make sense of the 660 million views? | | | |
| **Second Marker Comments:** | | | |