

**FOR ALL OF YOU**

This paper was supposed to be a demonstrative paper, which was to prove your mastering of as many elements of essay writing as possible.

The attention given to of its formal aspects might appear to you as out of proportion, but it was precisely this aspect that we found lacking in our students upon their graduation, and the one that needed improving.

Several requirements were critical. So critical that failure to meet these requirement had to lead to my rejection of the whole paper.

These minimal requirements are the following:

- B.** Bibliography. A well written bibliography was essential, including its most minute aspects (graphical pagination, punctuation). I required a minimal number of titles and a certain variety of types of sources. Using just Wikipedia or just encyclopedia sources did not prove that you could handle journal resources or foreign book resources.
- R.** Parenthetical references. Correct format was essential. Since we studies MLA and APA, it was natural to check these formats and not the footnote format (Oxford or Chicago or Sorbonne or whatever). If you gave more than the 3 elements required (MLA: Autor\_short, Title\_short: Page *or* APA: Author\_short, Year: Page), then you were not doing it *better*, but *worse*, because the main logic behind MLA and APA was *compactness*. If you gave web addresses in these references you were again committing a big error. If you gave the whole title details, you proved that you did not understand anything of either system.
- D.** The Work-in-Progress Dossier. I had specifically indicated that you were supposed to collect the materials that documented the “embryology” of your paper, including: the original sources that you had consulted (as handwritten notes, photocopies, CD or floppy files) – whereupon I checked the good habit of writing down the source origin – then the outline (plan) of the paper – to prove that you had some structuring idea behind your paper - –then the draft (early version) of the paper, to prove that you reworked your text (as any self-conscious researcher does) and checked for your typing or grammar errors (that is, you proofread it).
- P.** Absence of Plagiarism. I have zero tolerance for plagiarism. Plagiarism in the USA leads to the student’s expulsion from college. In Ro, the most I can do is grade the papers that are the result of plagiarism with a 1 (one).

In practical terms: if you did not comply with ANY of the above-mentioned requirements — that I signposted as **B, R, D** — then your paper is failed (grade = 4), no matter how good its content might be otherwise. If you committed **P** then you get the minimum grade, which is 1.

---

**COMAN Alina – English Patient [sic!]**

- Defficient title. Not only is it incorrect (the book's title is not "English Patient" but "THE English Patient", but it does not precise which line of interpretation you are following (if any...)). The author's name should be present after the title! Italics should be used for the title.
- Each paragraph is about something else. There is no leading idea in your essay.
- You are 100% enslaved to your sources.
- Massive quotations, that are neither integrated in the paper nor discussed.
- Titles are NEVER italicised in your essay, as they should!
- Your notes (=conspecte) are very disorderly!
- Confusing layout (=pagination), using buletted list form instead of Level 2 (or 3) intertitles.

*BIBLIO*

- so-called "cheat mills", i.e. disreputable sources providing pre-chewed food for lazy students, have been used: Gradesaver.com, the infamous SparkNotes, eNotes. These make 30% of your bibliography, which does not show you as a serious independent-minded researcher.

*PLAGIARISM!*

- You stole the whole ideation for your paper from "GradeSaver". Sources used:
  - <http://www.gradesaver.com/classicnotes/titles/english/questions.html>
  - <http://www.gradesaver.com/classicnotes/titles/english/themes.html>
  - I am sorry but PLAGIARISM from GradeSaver did not save your grade. Quite the contrary!
- 

**POPAN Anca – Inuit: History and tradition**

- Title too vague and wide... and obviously your 4-page paper cannot cover the extent of the vast promise made in the title!
- Focus too vague. Structure too loose.
- Fluency not great...
- Title page incomplete (lacks year, subject...etc)

*REFERENCES:*

- One title (*Populatiile lumii*) different from the Biblio, and without author.

*NOTES (CONSPECTE):*

- Better place your source details along with each note, not separately (they might get lost easily).
- 

**GAZ Larisa – Religion and Literature**

- Title seems to be incomplete... "in Canada..."
  - Article by Mihăieş lacks the mention of the journal where it comes from...
- 

**VAGNER Ramona – A la recherche du Canadien Errant**

- + Bonne présentation de Leonard Cohen, quoique un peu générale et banale...
- ~ Bonne introduction, mais un peu disproportionnée par rapport au reste

— Un éventuel soustitre aurait dû mentionner le nom de L. Cohen.

*REFERENCES:*

- Les auteurs en MAJUSCULES — quelle horreur! Non!
- un titre mentionné entre parenthèses est absent de votre Bibliographie

*BIBLIOGRAPHY:*

- Nombreux problèmes avec votre bibliographie (pas de tri alphabétique, ordre des éléments erroné, éléments manquants...)
- 

**VĂSUȚ Ioana** — [Creating a new world with the internet](#)

- + Nice personal approach. Good points about anonymity and identity on the forums.
- + Excellent interdisciplinary span from mythology to linguistics and from communication theory to McLuhan.
- + Lyrical and passionate defense of the forums, yet without abandoning a solid conceptual and theoretical foothold
- Bound / stapled dossier always preferable to those loose sheets (might get lost)
- Your dossier is a mess: no sources mentioned on the pages; no precision of the # of the draft; no page numbers.
- The title page is deficient; should contain your name, affiliation, subject (course) and date.
- The title, I think, could've been more precise too (as you speak about Canadian/Ro forum)
- + You got 1 point bonus for your fine Conference presentation!

**TI NDELA Melinda** — [Pro and Against Abortion](#)

- Since you particularize your discussion to Canada, this should have been made clear from the very title
- + Very clear and systematic presentation of a complex problem
- + Excellent Reference List.
- + Good personal attitudes at all the crucial points of your paper
- + Well-done non-resolved conclusion.

*BIBLIOGRAPHY:*

- ~ Paper would have been better served by an APA-style apparatus.
- Four volumes of *Britannica* — difficult to distinguish in MLA. Easier in APA (1994a, 1994b, 1994c...)

*REFERENCES:*

- Articles in encyclopedias should appear in your parenthetical references and NOT the titles of those encyclopedias (so "Abortion" and not *Britannica*)
- Abbreviations for the titles in the par.ref. should contain the first word(s) of the title for easier localization within the Ref.List. Otherwise the reader is at a loss trying to find those titles.

**HOSU Simona Angela** — [Canada, patrie du multi-culturalisme, quête identitaire](#)

*Je ne comprends pas votre présence dans cette série, mais je corrige quand même...*

- + Bonne présentation, claire et assez systématique
- + Bonnes références à la philosophie de la culture et l'imagologie
- Pas de dossier physique — aspect brimbalant...

*BIBLIOGRAPHY:*

- employez le guillemets français svp, « .... »
- les journaux scientifiques doivent avoir une précision de numéro et volume!

*REFERENCES:*

- suivez la même manière de traitement des titres que dans la Bibliographie : *italiques* pour les Titres, et « guillemets » pur les « Articles »