

Feedback Summary

My most common feedback was that my work was strong overall, but I still needed to make my writing clearer, more thorough, and more consistent. In MA1, I was told I had a solid foundation and did good research, but I needed to introduce the ICE issue itself more fully before shifting into social media, assume my audience did not already know the topic, and add more background from popular sources to explain the broader context. I also needed to improve how I handled source integration by making it clearer that I was reporting what scholars said rather than sounding like I was making my own claims. A big pattern in the feedback was that I needed stronger synthesis, especially by citing multiple sources in the same paragraph and explaining how sources connected, differed, or approached the issue in different ways.

Another common piece of feedback was that my organization was decent, but it could be pushed further to support my research question better. In MA1, I was told my topic generalizations and section wrap-ups were a strong effort, but I needed to add more sub-questions throughout my body paragraphs and especially in the conclusion. That would help me build more specific research questions and eventually stronger coding categories. I also got feedback that some citation details still needed work, especially MLA in-text citation format and adding the database name to scholarly Works Cited entries.

In MA2, the feedback was more focused on clarity and setup for the project design. My research question, thesis, limitations, and conclusion were all seen as clear, but I still needed to sharpen the format and explain my process more precisely. I was told to make the title more specific, possibly shorten the thesis by combining the rhetorical appeals, clarify exactly how I would do my sampling, and better explain each coding category and sub-category with a short introduction and the question each one was meant to answer.

Across both assignments, another repeated theme was that I needed to be more explicit and detailed in explaining what I was doing and why. I also got reminders to include transparency statements for any AI use, and in MA1 I was specifically warned that some of my paraphrasing sounded AI-generated, so I need to watch my wording more carefully. Overall, the feedback showed that my ideas and research were strong, but I most often needed to improve clarity, source synthesis, structure, and methodological explanation.

Revision Plan

null