

CPT898 ASSIGNMENT TWO : RESEARCH DESIGN

by Kate Marston

FILE	CPT898_FINAL.PDF (166.37K)		
TIME SUBMITTED	12-JAN-2016 02:04 PM	WORD COUNT	4186
SUBMISSION ID	51678406	CHARACTER COUNT	23579

Assignment Cover Sheet

CARDIFF
UNIVERSITY

PRIFYSGOL
CAERDYDD

Student Number:	1533673		
Module Code:	CPT898	Date:	12/01/2016
Essay Title:	CPT898 Assignment Two: Research Design		
Required Word Count:	3000	Actual Word Count:	3163

Feedback

In what ways do digital technologies mediate the peer cultures of LGBT+ young people?

This essay details the design of a participatory Msc research project exploring lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans (LGBT+) young people's digitally mediated peer cultures. In this context digital technologies include the internet, mobile communication devices and social media. LGBT+ is employed as a term to capture the multitude of minority sexual and gender identity labels beyond heterosexual and cisgender¹. This research aims to:

Good

1. Understand digitally mediated peer cultures from LGBT+ young people's own perspectives and experiences in the context of their everyday lives
2. Enable LGBT+ young people to identify what kinds of knowledge and support they need (if any) in negotiating digitally mediated peer cultures
3. Critically examine the processes, challenges and opportunities of participatory research with young people
4. Collaborate with LGBT+ young people to establish guidelines for future participatory research exploring their digitally mediated peer cultures

The research project is informed by my experience as a voluntary sector practitioner working with LGBT+ young people across the West of England. In this essay I will briefly explore the background literature related to young people's digital cultures and the theoretical underpinnings of my inquiry. I will then outline the ethical framework for the research and detail how the literature, theory and my professional experience have informed the research design.

Excellent

¹ Cisgender is a term used to describe someone whose biological sex and gender identity match i.e someone who does not identify as trans.

Background

The role digital technologies play in young people's lives has attracted an increasing amount of scholarly attention. Academic, policy and practitioner treatment of the topic has been predominantly concerned with the the risks and opportunities aligned with these technologies. The *EU Kids Online* network, for example, conduct large-scale surveys measuring the prevalence and impact of risks such as cyberbullying, sexual messages, upsetting content or meeting contacts offline and opportunities such as communicating with friends, exploring civic interests, creating content and completing homework (see Livingstone et al 2015; Livingstone et al 2014; Helsper et al. 2013; Hasebrink et al. 2011). These survey studies make an important case for researching young people's digital practices. Yet they are limited in reflecting the nature of these practices which 'blur the neat categories imposed by survey researchers' (Ringrose et al. 2012, p.14). These studies struggle to capture the way digital technologies weave together a range of 'content, contact and conduct', travel across online and offline environments and interact with structural features of identity like sexuality or gender (Ringrose et al. 2012, p. 15; Van Doorn, 2011).

Excellent

Literature exploring LGBT+ young people's digital experiences is limited but a number of small-scale qualitative studies have identified the different risks and opportunities they encounter. On the one hand, these technologies are associated with risks such as prejudice-based harassment (Varjas et al. 2013) and premature 'outing' for LGBT+ young people (Duguay 2015). On the other hand, they are recognised as a vital source of information, support and connection that may be lacking in their offline worlds (Duguay 2015; Taylor et al. 2014; Varjas et al. 2013; Hillier 2008). Digital practices can therefore be simultaneously risky and opportunistic (Livingstone 2008). With this in mind, Ringrose and Barajas (2011) argue that we need to exceed the 'risk / opportunity binary' which 'implies a conscious rational actor' choosing between 'risky or healthy options' and overlooks the much more 'messy and complex' relations of young people (Ringrose and Barajas 2011, p.3).

Good

To explore these relations I have turned to the conceptual tools offered by Deleuze and Guattari's posthumanism. Drawing on their concept of 'assemblages' young people's digital lives can be understood as temporary groupings of relations to other bodies (e.g friends, family, celebrities, teachers) and things (e.g phones, tablets, websites, 'apps', videos,

Good

images) (Ringrose 2011). These assemblages are always 'becoming' through 'rhizomatic' multi-directional movements that cannot be captured in linear trajectories towards risk or opportunity (Fox and Alldred, p. 3). The task at hand is to map the 'multiple becomings' (Renold and Ringrose 2011, p. 402) and 'affective capacities' (Coleman 2008, p. 26) of these digital assemblages. All bodies and things can 'affect or be affected' (Deleuze and Guattari 2004, p. 288). This is an agential capability to bring about a physical, psychological, emotional or social 'change of state or capacities' (Fox and Alldred 2015, p. 3). Mapping digital becomings and affects requires exceeding the methodological reliance on discursive analysis to explore how the digital looks, feels, sounds, moves and materialises (Hickey-Moody 2013).

My research seeks to employ a participatory methodology for undertaking this mapping. Participatory research is popular within childhood and youth studies where young people are recognised as 'agents of knowledge about their own lives and are active participants in the research endeavour' (Mallan et al. 2010). Few studies into young people's digital practices however have adopted a participatory approach (notable exceptions include Tarapdar and Kellet 2013; Mallan et al. 2010). As I will discuss later what constitutes participatory research has been broadly conceptualised and I do not presume these approaches produce inherently 'better' research (Holland 2010). Instead I wish to consider how participation might support 'a critical and reflexive ethical framework' for research that affirms young people's rights whilst enhancing knowledge of their digitally mediated peer cultures (Holland 2010, p. 372).

Ethics

Ethics is an explicit concern of this study therefore I have foregrounded the discussion here. In designing this study, I have considered throughout its effects on those involved including the participants, myself and the research settings. I have referred to the ethical guidelines outlined by the British Sociological Association (BSA) (2002) and the National Children's Bureau (Shaw et al. 2011). In keeping with these guidelines, informed consent will be sought from participants and their settings before the research begins. I will maintain the anonymity of participants and their settings, for example, by allowing them to choose pseudonyms and being careful to exclude information that may reveal their identity.

Research records will be kept confidential and securely stored.

Drawing on Heath et al (2007) and Skelton (2008) I also recognise that tensions exists between institutional ethics and participation for young people. The requirement for parental consent for under-16's, for example, is likely to exclude LGBT+ young people who are not 'out' to their parents (Shaw et al. 2011, p. 30; Skelton 2008, pp. 29 - 32). There may be grounds for waiving the parental consent requirement as a potential breach of confidentiality (Shaw et al. 2011, p. 30). At the time of writing however I have not worked out whether an ethics committee would recognise it as such. Additionally, not seeking parental consent could make access harder as educational settings may feel unconfident about facilitating the research. I have chosen therefore to limit the research to young people aged over 16 where parental consent is not required.

Excellent

1

Coleman and Ringrose (2013) note how researchers 'need to be responsible for the "cuts" that are made in the practice of "boundary-making"' within research, such as who is included and excluded (p. 6). This means being attentive to the ways researchers become 'entangled within the assemblage they seek to study' (Coleman and Ringrose 2013, p. 6) and how the tools and techniques selected open up or shut down affective flows (Fox and Alldred 2015, p. 16). In pursuing a participatory agenda, I am seeking a design that opens the affective flows between young people and the research processes whilst being considerate of how my design choices shuts down flows. Ethical considerations have been threaded throughout this essay to put into practice a reflexive and ongoing concern with ethics from design to dissemination.

Excellent

Good

Research Design

To meet my research aims I am proposing a case study design. Case studies are conducive to studying the affective assemblages of young people's digital lives as they allow for 'in-depth understanding of a single or small number of "cases," set in their real-world contexts' (Yin 2012, p. 4). Case studies can incorporate the different textures and 'granularity' of events (Fox and Alldred 2015, p. 14) rather than aggregating them into something 'smooth, coherent and precise' (Coleman and Ringrose 2013, p. 5). For this study my case will be the experiences of young people attending a college-based LGBT+ group in the West of England.

Excellent

Based on my professional experience, I am aware a growing number of colleges have established LGBT+ groups. These groups are social and support groups for students who identify as LGBT+ and may be student or teacher led. As a case these groups enable access to my target participants in their everyday educational environment. In selecting the case study, I will consider factors such as number of attendees of the group, geography (i.e urban or rural), socio-economic status and ethnic diversity of the college. To avoid familiarity effecting the research process I will also take into account whether I have previously worked with the group (Mannay 2015, pp. 27 - 41). A single case study is conducive to my methodological choice of participatory research as it will allow me to focus on building a dialogic relationship with the group.

Participatory research

Participatory research has been broadly conceptualised: ranging from consulting participants about the research to collaborating with them throughout to formally training participants in social research methods so they may take ownership of the process (Groundwater-Smith et al. 2015, p. 63). For the purpose of this research I have conceptualised my approach as a combination of consultative and collaborative. Participants will be invited to research their own lives and shape aspects of the research process, such as design, data collection, analysis or dissemination. The amount of participation will vary dependent on the stage of the research with, for example, design being more consultative and data collection more collaborative. Holland et al (2010) argue however it is more important to 'pay close attention to *how* participation is enacted' than 'focus in on *how much* participation was achieved' (p. 373).

By adopting a participatory approach, I am seeking to design a study that is meaningful to the participants involved and provides a platform for LGBT+ young people to 'have a say' as a group who are 'amongst the least likely to be able to access their rights' (Shaw et al. 2011, p. 16). Holland et al (2010) note that 'agency', 'empowerment' and 'voice' are contested concepts within participatory research but often theorised as something 'enabled, promoted or "given" by the "adult researcher"' (p. 362). These views however simplistically and statically separate adults as 'powerful and independent' from children as 'powerless and dependent' (Holland et al. 2010, p. 362). I see power as much more relational

recognising that all children have the agency to 'affect or be affected' by the research process (Deleuze and Guattari 2004, p. 288). Gallagher (2008) notes how researchers can be unprepared for the way children may 'exploit, appropriate, redirect, contest or refuse participatory techniques' (p. 137). This can lead to researchers unwittingly regulating participation (Fox 2013; Gallagher 2008). As Edwards and Mauthner (2002) explain, 'rather than ignoring or blurring power positions, ethical practice needs to pay attention to them' (p. 27) and, I would argue, intervene where possible to ensure the 'operationalisation of power' does not unduly inhibit some participants' freedom to direct the process (Holland et al. 2010, p. 363).

Excellent

In planning a participatory project, I had to take into account the fact that important aspects of the research (e.g question, design and ethics) require institutional approval before the young people can participate (Groundwater-Smith et al. 2015; Skelton 2008). I have sought therefore to set exploratory and open sub-aims that leave space for young people's input into key decisions. They can decide which aspect of their everyday digital lives they explore (Aim 1) and the knowledge and support they would like in negotiating their digitally mediated peer cultures (Aim 2). Additionally, a range of data collection methods will be ethically applied for and presented to the young people so they can exercise choice in the 'research instruments and processes' (Atkins 2013, p. 147; Fox 2013). This is important groundwork for sustaining the interest of the young people and ensuring the research is meaningful to them (Groundwater-Smith et al. 2015, p.87). They will also be invited to critically reflect upon the research design and methods (Aim 3) and contribute to guidelines for future participatory research (Aim 4).

Excellent

ACCESS AND CONSENT

Groundwater-Smith et al (2015) highlight that multiple gatekeepers can 'facilitate or deny access to researchers' (p. 78) as well as 'limit or open up the scope of inquiry' (p. 82). Given the restricted timeline to complete this study, I intend to utilise my existing professional networks with senior leadership team members at colleges in the West of England to negotiate access to LGBT+ groups. Additional gatekeepers could include safeguarding teams and the staff or young people in charge of the groups. I will speak with each gatekeeper to detail the aims and purpose of the research, how students could participate and the ethical

framework in place. These discussions will also be an opportunity to learn about the setting, their safeguarding procedures and how my research schedule could fit with the settings timetables and term dates. Utilising existing relationships with key gatekeepers will hopefully avoid significant delays in the research schedule.

Heath et al (2007) warn that consent can be assumed of young people once adult gatekeepers have provided permission. Careful consideration will be given to seeking the engagement of young people and ensuring they are properly informed about the research. Detailed information will be provided about the nature and purpose of the study including the methods involved, how data will be recorded, analysed and disseminated, potential benefits of the study and their right to withdraw (NCB 2011). Opt-in informed consent will be sought from participants and their settings before the collection of any personal data via a signed consent form. Consent forms will be written in clear and accessible language. For those who agree to participate in the study I will arrange convenient dates, times and locations within the college to undertake the fieldwork activities. It may be that not everyone who signs up wishes to be engaged in all aspects of the research. In keeping with it's participatory agenda, I will be as flexible and responsive as possible to accommodate young people at the different points they want to engage (Groundwater-Smith et al. 2015, p. 83).

Excellent

METHODS, ANALYSIS AND DISSEMINATION

The methods selected for participatory research need to assist in developing 'trust and rapport' with participants, show due regard for their competencies and be adaptable to their preferred mode of communication (Groundwater-Smith et al. 2015, p. 103). In developing this cache of methods I also considered how they could 'stretch existing textual methods so that they might witness, analyse and evoke the affective' and multi-sensory dimensions of digital technologies (Lorimer 2013, p. 16). The exact methods I will adopt are still being finalised but they could include mapping and tours, digital diaries, ethnography and semi-structured interviews.

Mapping is a visual technique that encourages participants to 'represent their localised worlds as they imagine them to be' through drawing or collaging (Mannay 2015, p. 4).

Good

Participants can be invited to assemble maps to represent the people and things that make up their digital world. Digital tours can build upon these representational maps by inviting participants to navigate significant websites, applications or social networks with the researcher (Duguay 2014; Ringrose et al. 2012). Alternatively, participants could keep diaries of their everyday digital routine capturing diverse data sets such as links, screenshots, videos, music or text at regular intervals (Plowman and Stevenson 2012). These could either be sent immediately to the researcher's e-mail account or saved in a word doc over a set period of time. Both maps, tours and diaries can be used as elicitation devices whereby participants talk the researcher through their digital networks including how it looks, sounds, feels (physically and emotionally) and so on (Mannay 2015).

Good

Good

Additionally, I will heed Mannay's (2014) call that such individual techniques need to be 'embedded in traditional ethnography' to 'demonstrate epistemic cognition' (p. 178). Permission will be sought to keep ethnographic field notes and audio recordings throughout the collaboration. Fieldnotes have proved a useful device in participatory projects for reflecting on how participation was enacted and how it could be improved (Fox 2013; Gallagher 2008). Individual or friendship group semi-structured interviews will also be offered to participants to further contextualise the data produced, allowing them to provide expert testimony on their experiences, assess the effectiveness of the research methods and contribute to guidelines for future participatory work (Mannay 2015).

Excellent

This range of data collection techniques will translate a 'heteroglossia of data', including visual materials, transcripts and ethnographic field notes (Braidotti 2007, p. 68). Young people will be involved in analysis through 'continual analytical talk' throughout the project and offered a discrete follow-up session focusing on analytic activities (Holland et al. 2010, p. 372). This could include identifying key themes across the data they produced as well as providing participants an opportunity to check their interview transcriptions for accuracy. In keeping with my epistemological position, analysis also requires attending to 'fragments of data that do not neatly fit under codes or render decisive meaning' to explore detail and complexity rather than moving too quickly to abstraction, reduction or generalisation (Maclure 2013, p. 171).

The research findings could also be brought to life through a number of dissemination

activities. The possibility for engaging in collaborative dissemination with participants, after the formal dissertation requirement, could be explored such as creating a presentation, workshop or blog post (Groundwater-Smith et al. 2015, pp. 159 - 180). Alternatively, the project could conclude with a researcher delivered workshop accessibly detailing the findings of the project to the LGBT+ group and formally thanking participants for their engagement.

Conclusion: trustworthiness and authenticity of the study

To conclude this essay detailing my Msc research project I will discuss the trustworthiness and authenticity of its design. Bryman (2012) notes that trustworthiness and authenticity, as opposed to reliability and validity, are important criteria for assessing the quality of qualitative research that does not presuppose a 'single absolute account of social reality is feasible' (p. 390). In terms of the credibility of my proposed research by adopting a participatory approach I am placing 'respondent validation' at the very heart of the study (Bryman 2012, p. 390). Careful consideration has been given throughout as to how I can represent participants' perspectives and experiences. The analytic task of attending to detail, complexity and singularity can also bring into check the researchers 'imperial self-assurance' by allowing space for uncertainty and contradictions in the data (MacLure 2013, p. 172). An in-depth understanding of the particularities of a single case study may limit the transferability of the study however an explicit aim is to establish guidelines for future participatory research. By being transparent about the research design and implementation I hope to enable future researchers to replicate my approach and build on my learning. This includes taking the findings forward to develop a design for my own participatory PhD research project.

Good

Bibliography

Atkins, L. 2013. Researching 'with' not 'on': engaging marginalised learners in the research process. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* 18(1), pp. 143 – 158.

Braidotti, R. 2007. Feminist epistemology after postmodernism: critiquing science, technology and globalisation. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews* 32(1), p. 65 – 74.

British Sociological Association. 2002. Statement of Ethical Practice for the British Sociological Association. London: BSA.

Bryman, A. 2012. *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coleman, B. 2008. The Becoming of Bodies. *Feminist Media Studies* 8(2), pp. 163–179.

Coleman, B. and Ringrose J. eds, 2013. *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. 2004. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: Continuum.

Duguay, S. 2014. "He has a way gayer Facebook than I do": Investigating sexual identity disclosure and context collapse on a social networking site. *New Media & Society* 16(6), pp. 1 - 17.

Edwards, R. and Mauthner, M. 2002. Ethics and Feminist Research: Theory and Practice. In: Mauthner, M., Birch, M., Jessop, J. and Miller, T. eds. 2002. *Ethics in Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Fox, N. and Alldred, P. 2015. Inside the Research-Assemblage: New Materialism and the Micropolitics of Social Inquiry. *Sociological Research Online* 20(2), pp. 1 – 19.

Fox, R. 2013. Resisting participation: critiquing participatory research methodologies with young people. *Journal of Youth Studies* 16(8), pp. 986 – 999.

Gallagher, M. 2008. 'Power is not an evil': rethinking power in participatory methods. *Children's Geographies* 6(2), pp. 137 – 150.

Groundwater-Smith, S., Dockett, S. and Bottrell, D. 2015. *Participatory Research with Children and Young People*. London: Sage.

Hasebrink, U., Görzig, A., Haddon, L., Kalmus, V., and Livingstone, S. 2011. *Patterns of risk and safety online: in-depth analyses*. London: EU Kids Online.

Heath, S., Charles, V., Crow, G. and Wiles, R. 2007. Informed consent, gatekeepers and go-betweens: negotiating consent in child and youth orientated institutions. *British Educational Research Journal* 33(3), pp. 403 – 417.

Helsper, E., Kalmus, V., Hasebrink, U., Sagvari, B. and de Haan, J. 2013. *Country classification: Opportunities, risks, harm and parental mediation*. London: EU Kids Online.

Hickey-Moody, A. 2013. Affect as Method: Feelings, Aesthetics and Affective Pedagogy. In: Coleman, B. and Ringrose J. eds, 2013. *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 79 – 95.

Hillier, L. 2007. Building Realities Less Limited Than Their Own: Young People Practicing Same-Sex Attraction on the Internet. *Sexualities* 10(1), pp. 82 – 100.

Holland, S., Renold, E., Ross, N. and Hillman, A. 2010. Power, agency and participatory agendas: A critical exploration of young people's engagement in participative qualitative research. *Childhood* 17(3), pp. 360 - 375.

Livingstone, S., Mascheroni, G., and Staksrud, E. 2015. *Developing a framework for researching children's online risks and opportunities in Europe*. London: EU Kids Online.

Livingstone, S., Mascheroni, G., Ólafsson, K. and Haddon, L. 2014. *Children's online risks and opportunities: Comparative findings from EU Kids Online and Net Children Go Mobile*. London: EU Kids Online.

Livingstone, S. 2008. Taking risky opportunities in youthful content creation: teenagers' use of social networking sites for intimacy, privacy and self-expression. *New Media & Society* 10(3), pp.459–477.

Lorimer, J. 2013. More-Than-Human Visual Analysis: Witnessing and Evoking Affect in Human-Nonhuman Interactions. In: Coleman, B. and Ringrose J. eds, 2013. *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 61 – 78.

Maclure, M. 2013. Classification or Wonder? Coding as an Analytic Practice in Qualitative Research. In: Coleman, B. and Ringrose J. eds, 2013. *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 164 – 183.

Mallan, K., Singh, P. and Giardina, N. 2010. The challenges of participatory research with 'tech-savvy' youth. *Journal of Youth Studies* 13(2), pp. 255 – 272.

Mannay, D. 2015. *Visual, Narrative and Creative Research Methods: Application, reflection and ethics*. London: Routledge.

Mannay, D. 2014. Doing ethnography or applying a qualitative technique? Reflections from the 'waiting field'. *Qualitative Research* 15(2), pp. 166 – 182.

Plowman, L. and Stevenson, O. 2012. Using mobile-phone diaries to explore children's everyday lives. *Childhood* 19(4), pp. 539 – 553.

Renold, E. and Ringrose, J. 2011. Schizoid subjectivities? Re-theorising teen-girls' sexual cultures in an era of 'sexualisation'. *Journal of Sociology* 47(4), pp. 389 – 409.

Ringrose, J., Gill, J., Livingstone, S., and Harvey, L. 2012. *A qualitative study of children, young people and 'sexting'*. London: NSPCC.

Ringrose, J. and Barajas, K. 2011. Gendered risks and opportunities? Exploring teen girls' digital sexual identity in postfeminist media contexts. *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics* 7(2), pp. 121 – 138.

Ringrose, J. 2011. Beyond Discourse? Using Deleuze and Guattari's schizoanalysis to explore affective assemblages, heterosexually striated space and lines of flight online and at school. *Educational Philosophy & Theory* 43(6), pp. 598 – 618.

Shaw, C., Brady, L., and Davey, C. 2011. *Guidelines for Research with Children and Young People*. London: National Children's Bureau.

Skelton, T. 2008. Research with children and young people: exploring the tensions between ethics, competence and participation. *Children's Geographies* 6(1), pp. 21 – 36.

Tarapdar, S. and Kellett, M. 2013. Cyberbullying: Insights and Age-Comparison Indicators from a Youth-Led study in England. *Childhood Indicators Research* 6(3), pp. 461 – 477.

Taylor, Y., Falconer, E., and Snowden, R., 2014. Queer youth, Facebook and faith: Facebook methodologies and online identities. *New Media & Society* 16(7), pp. 1138 – 1153.

Van Doorn, N. 2011. Digital spaces, material traces: How matter comes to matter in online performance of gender, sexuality and embodiment. *Media, Culture and Society* 33(4), pp. 531 – 547.

Varjas K., Meyers J. and Kiperman S. 2013. Technology hurts? Lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth perspectives of technology and cyberbullying. *Journal of School Violence* 12(1), pp. 27–44.

Yin, R. 2012. *Applications of case study research*. Washington DC: SAGE Publications.

CPT898 ASSIGNMENT TWO : RESEARCH DESIGN

GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

95/100

GENERAL COMMENTS

Instructor

This is an exceptionally well written essay of publishable quality which far exceeds the levels of achievement normally expected at this level.

You demonstrate a thorough knowledge of the principles, key concepts and theoretical approaches relevant to the learning outcomes in this module. Your discussion of ethics and mapping in particular demonstrate high levels of critical understanding.

You provide exceptional evidence of clear and original thought and demonstrate that you can analyse concepts and theories and apply them to the practical issues of research design in a systematic way.

It is difficult to identify areas where you could improve your mark but you could have more fully developed some of your insightful comments on ethics by more fully engaging in the literature to reflect upon how other researchers have tackled similar issues.

It was a pleasure to read this essay. Well done.

PAGE 1

QM

Feedback

See "General Comments" at end of the print-ready version of this paper for general feedback on your assessment - note that I am using a grading form which is visible if you click on the far right icon at the bottom of the window (it looks like a tiny office block)

PAGE 2

QM

Good

Good

QM

Excellent

Excellent

PAGE 3

QM

Citation Needed

Cite Source:

Please use the link below to find links to information regarding specific citation styles:

http://www.plagiarism.org/plag_article_citation_styles.html

Additional Comment Reference here

QM

Excellent

Excellent

QM

Good

Good

QM

Good

Good

PAGE 4

QM

Good

Good

QM

Good

Good

QM

Good

Good

QM

Good

Good

QM

Excellent

Excellent

QM

Good

Good

PAGE 5

QM

Excellent

Excellent



Comment 1

You need to take advice on this. There is a paper in this alone. If you haven't already done so you should consider some of Gill Valentine's biographical work on sexuality and ethics.

QM

Excellent

Excellent

QM

Good
Good

QM

Excellent
Excellent

PAGE 6

QM

Good
Good

QM

Good
Good

QM

Excellent
Excellent

PAGE 7

QM

Excellent
Excellent

QM

Excellent
Excellent

PAGE 8

QM

Excellent
Excellent

QM

Good
Good

PAGE 9

QM

Good
Good

QM

Good
Good

QM

Excellent
Excellent

PAGE 10

QM

Good

Good



Good
Good



Good
Good



Good
Good

PAGE 11



Excellent
Excellent

PAGE 12

PAGE 13

PAGE 14
