

OBSERVATII PRIVIND LUCRARILE SCRISE – ESEU ACADEMIC 1.2

ACHIM Daniela (Jazz: Still Popular or just a Myth? Past and present for jazz music)

- + Good biblio and references
- Many awkward, badly written sentences
- You lost some of the URL's (web addresses)

LEXIC

- confusions: *trust* à *confidence*; *trustful* à *confident*
- *decade* ≠ *decadere* = *deceniu*
- *loose* ≠ *a pierde* = *desfăcut*, *nelegat* (corect: *lose*)
- invented words („furculitions”) = *interprets* (à *interpreters*)
- contrasted forms (*don't*, *isn't*, *can't*) not acceptable in academic essay
- “*check a wish*” (inexistent phrase)

GRAMMAR

- *disagreements Subject/Predicate*
- *trouble with formulating questions (you forget about inverting S & P)*

CHIRIA Florina (Wine, good or not?)

- + Good bibliography and PERFECT parenthetical references. Bravo!
- Pro and against arguments not too clearly organized
- Constant error: You refer to the objects and actions as HE or HIM.
Remember, objects and actions are neutral, therefore: IT (ITS in the Genitive)

LEXIC

- Confusion: “*poured melt metal on the neck*”. The articipule of *to melt* is *molten*. *Neck* means “*exteriorul gâtului sau ceafa cuiva*”. Contrast with *Throat* = *gâtlej*, *beregata* (*deci interiorul gâtului, esofagul*). Corect, deci: “*poured molten metal into his throat*”.
- “*the lost of lives*”. *Lost* nu e decât participiu, nu și substantiv. *Pierdere* = *loss*.

COSTIN Maria (Coffeine, a drug or not?)

- + Excellent bibliography. Faultless references. Good abstract. Solid structure. Nice personal touch in the end.

LEXIC

- *higher with 25%* à *higher BY 25%*

DANCIU Irina (Migration - A Problem or a Solution for Humanity?)

- + Much better paper than your previous one (the one about 9.11). Better organizing, better command of English.
- + PERFECT bibliography, very good References.
- Some online adresses appear in your parenthetical references. Wrong!

LEXIC

- *I am not agree* à *I do not agree*. Expresia nu se construiește cu verbul *to be* ca în lb română.

DRAGOȘ Adela-Maria (To drink or not to drink..)

- + Very nicely organized dossier.
- The argumentative nature of your essay is not properly reflected in the paper's structure.
- Several quotations and their parenthetical references CANNOT be traced down to any title in the bibliography. This is a serious error. You failed this exam because of this error.

HAPCA Alexandra (Smoking - A Real Threat to Our Health)

- + Correct, well balanced paper. Substantial dossier.
 - The first part should have been more neutral. More counterarguments would have helped
 - Several repetitive problems with your Parenthetical References:
 - first names not needed
 - p. or pp. before page numbers – not needed
 - *My translation* as first element → it should come last
 - link (web address) for online sources → never!
 - only multiple books by same authors need listing
- I hesitated about failing you because of all these redundant errors.
- Errors in Bibliography:
 - missing year of creation of several websites
 - the Title of the wider web resource (website)
 - date of your visit to the website.
 - item numbering not needed

LEXIC

- *the actions entreprised* → *actions undertaken*
 - *tabu* → *taboo*
-

IANCĂU Antonia (AIDS/HIV - Discrimination in Romanian society)

- This is NOT an argumentative essay, as was required! No counterarguments present.
- 10 Parenthetical references point at titles that are ABSENT from your bibliography.

These are two reasons why you failed this exam.

NĂPRĂDEAN Nicoleta (Controversy over Cloning)

- I did not bother to read the rest of your paper the moment I realized that:
 - There was NO DOSSIER (work-in-progress)
 - The Bibliography consisted of suspect titles (impossible to locate in Romania) and had no less than 53 errors, many of them consistent and structural, such as:
 - No alphabetization
 - Mixed styles MLA plus APA
 - No place; – No publisher

Verdict: Failed.

MIHUȚ Ancuța (People migration)

- Horrid grammar. Awful translation of quotations. Pathetic paraphrases.
- No structure whatsoever (no order of demonstration)
- Neither place nor place ever mentioned – and this in a sociological essay!
- No historical contextualization.
- Poorly introduced quotations.
- A terrible patching of randomly chosen quotations.

LEXIC

- *unlikely* nu înseamnă *neplăcut*, ci *improbabil*.
-

MICULAI CIUC Lidia (Is it right to be nostalgic regarding the Communist period?)

- + Good choice of theme, well chosen bibliography (several essential titles by Lucian Boia). Obvious personal effort.
- The structure is however not very well designed.
- Arguments are not organized in clear contrasting pairs.
- Some naiveties and crudity of language (*ration eating* for *food rationing*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- is it MLA or APA? Appers to be mixed!

REFERENCES

- titles should be shortened
- auhtor need for multiple authored books
- *translation mina* needed

POMIAN Codruța-Oana (Should I keep My Pet?)

- The previous from the previous paper is rather modest. Too similar to that paper. The somehow trivial title has little justification in the content of the paper.
- Inconsistent parenthetical references.
- The argumentative part is not contrasting enough and is little developed.
- The paper scores correctly by ticking all the right boxes, but I am a bit disappointed by the lack of some "argumentation temperature"...

POP Maria (Is the Dandy Identical with the snob?)

- + Best paper in class!
- + Excellent organization of vast information.
- + Perfect balance of opposing arguments. Superbly researched.
- + Should be presented in a students' conference!

SEBESTYÉN (COVACIU) Mónika (Impact of Deforestation)

- I see little difference against your previous paper. This was supposed to be an argumentative essay and it never becomes one... This was one basic requirement, remember?
- Bibliography: inconsistent style, hovering between MLA and APA... You will have to rewrite this, by putting a bit of more significant effort into it.

SOLOMEȘ Claudia Dorina (Premarital Sex - Should We Or Not?)

- ? *should we or not..* what? Has the sound of a kinky innuendo...
- Sources are neither specialist nor prestigious.
- References in consistently wrong format. I was on the verge of failing you...

ȘOFINETI Larisa (Are families important?)

- + An OK paper that scores correctly in all the fields.
- + Nice personal involvement and passion.
- In your Bibliography too many titles are merely encyclopedia entries (therefore rather general and informative). Too few expert / specialist titles.

ȘUTEU Răzvan

- + Very well structured paper.
- + Excellent use of connectors.
- + Well balanced structure. You do not reveal your personal preference until the very end. I had to keep my breath!
- Graphically, you should use either Paragraphs with indented first line (like in novels) OR block paragraphs with spaces (like in emails).

ANUL 2

CIOBOTARU Ana (Eat to live or Live to Eat?)

- + Fairly good. Good bibliography & references.
- The argumentative part occurs fairly late in your paper
- Some longer quotations would have needed indenting (citătr retras)
- Involuntary humour: In a context about food, you mentioned animals being *tamed for meat, milk or food* (Well, we don't eat fur, do we?)