

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 studied 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.

BONTE Adriana Rozalia

- + Elegant folder. Good content.
- + Good parenthetical references.
- Long quotations should be made into Block quotes (indented)

BIBLIO

- pages not required for whole books
-

GRABAN Rita

- + Sujet très captivant, bien documenté, bonne maîtrise des termes de spécialité. Analyse pertinente, bien écrite.
- A few long quotations should have been treated as block quotes.

BIBLIO

- 12 erreurs: ordre des éléments, ponctuation.

REFERENCES

- Mélange de styles MLA + notes en bas de page.
 - Il n'y a que 5 titres traités dans une espèce de MLA, mais là des détails superflus abondent : long titres, prénom des auteurs.
 - Alors, le système de références n'est ni unitaire ni correct à donc **R**
-

HOSU Simona-Angelica

- Dossier minuscule.
- Références insuffisantes.
- Les style MLA ne supporte pas les notes en bas de page. (à finales OK)

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

- manque l'ordre alphabétique de éléments
- 52 erreurs
- présence d'un ghetto Internet. Il ne faut pas traiter les sources Internet comme une espèce de paria et les mettre dans un ghetto à part. On doit les ranger avec les autres.
- tous les sources Internet manquent des détails comme : l'auteur, le titre, la date de création, la date de votre visite.

- Mais le grand problème est que votre essai est le résultat intégral d'un

plagiat sans gêne et qui vous disqualifie. Avant de jeter votre essai, j'ai identifié 3 sources Internet parfaitement visible pour n'importe qui dont vous avez copié copieusement et sans gêne (Voir détails dans l'autre fichier ici). Donc : **P**, donc : 1.

Shame on you!

KERESZTES Ildiko Andrea

- Title too vague. Paper lacks somewhat a proper focus (what is it about actually?)
- Dossier : thorough mention of source details for books (kudos!) but none for online materials. This is a problem, as these might disappear in time or change address.

BIBLIO

- individual book chapters should not be listed separately in your biblio (unless they are each written by a different author, such as in an anthology).

- some of the internet sources that you indicated as having *no date*, do in fact display a date, on condition that you search a bit. Please consult the other file here for details.

MAN Pop Carmen

- Ouvrage sans une focalisation trop stricte, parfois assez naïvement formulé.
- Difficile à lire à cause de manque de retrait de paragraphe.
- Titres non soulignés (bold) et pouvant passer inaperçus.
- Citations en excès, vous citez trop souvent et trop longuement; votre contribution est moindre.
- Espacement erratique AVANT et APRÈS la ponctuation. Apprenez SVP comment on frappe correctement:

MOT,espace

MOT.espace

MOT:espace ou, en français MOT espace:espace

MOT;espace ou, en français MOT espace;espace

MOT)espace

espace(MOT

MOT?espace ou, en français MOT espace?espace

RÉFÉRENCES

- Votre système de références est complètement à tort! Vous donnez trop de détails (maison d'édition, place, p. pour pages, etc.) à donc **R**

MATIES Mariana

BIBLIO

- little variety in titles but otherwise great

REFERENCES

- very good system of references
- focus weak, diffuse.

MIERLUTIU Marieta

- + This is a pleasant, well written paper, with a nice personal touch. But, formally, it suffers from:

D — No dossier of work-in-progress as required

R — References in wrong format. Serious deficiencies: too verbose.

B — Bibliography in wrong format

- Structural unbalance. The fact that you deal with TWO concepts should also have been made clear in the very text of your paper, not just in the abstract.
- Long quotations need to be indented (CTRL-M them!)

MUREȘAN Sebastian

- + Ouvrage très soigné, bien documenté et portant sur les recherches antérieures de l'auteur.
- Pourtant...
- Il n'y a que deux citations, tandis que je vous avais exigé 10!

-
- Vous employez le style Chicago / Oxford avec des notes en bas de page. On a discuté tout le semestre au sujet des notes parenthetiques (MLA et APA) alors est-ce anormal que je voulais voir de telles notes?
 - Sujet peu lié au Canada. Semble être un sujet recyclé... Il y a une tout petite mention du Canada, mais seulement dans le dernier paragraphe...
 - Vous donnez pour la source d'un document une voie portant sur votre ordinateur, pas sur la toile. Pas valable, car c'est une voie relative et « hors ligne » (offline)
-

RUS Valeria

- + Best paper in class.
 - + Very good focus. good mastering of key critical terms.
 - + Perfect bibliography and references.
 - + Tough, shocking beginning.
 - Hey, where are your page numbers?
-

SABO Camelia

- + Dossier très soigné. Thème bien recherché.
 - Votre documentation dépend excessivement du site officiel du Cirque du Soleil.
 - Quand même, contrairement à mes demandes il n'y a pas aucune référence parenthetique. Je vous avais demandé spécifiquement une dizaine de telles références, accompagnant un mélange de citations et paraphrases.
 - Seulement 4-5 citation et pas de sources.
 - Ceci étant un essai démonstratif — ç.à.d. un ou vous devriez prouver vos competences en essai scientifique... à *donc R*
-

TATARLI Aliona

- + Excellent bibliography and references in APA style (though fewer than required).
 - + Focus problem. You are using fiction as if it were a historical document. You do not mark the points where you move from a historical or sociological detail to fictional territory (novel). You should have signalled these transitions form fact to fiction.
 - Some grammar problems.
 - Fiction characters are never introduced. Neither are the books they appear it. We have to guess that these are novels, and that they are probably Canadian.
 - Unfortunately missing:
 - Title page + date + class
 - Abstract + keyword
 - Work-in-progress dossier containing: Draft, Outline, Materials...
- à *so D*
-

VARGA Monica

- + Nice comparative study of 'geneses' in several first nations' mythology. Good intuitions ruling the criteria for this contrastive study.
- However, it seems to be lacking somewhat the appeal to specialist hermeneutic or anthropologic bibliography (Eliade, Gennep...)
- Lack of variety in sources. No journal, just one book.
- ...which make your references look as if chosen to fit the simplest type (internet refs).
- First line in each paragraph should be withdrawn (indented). Otherwise the reading of your paper becomes a torment to the eye.
- Physical dossier & folder missing...