Critical thinking PPT supplementary material

Analysis of the text on Slide 19

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Text | Comment | Critical thinking features  (Slide 15)[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| To evaluate and examine the methods of identity formation amongst young people, I am going to focus on micro-celebrities as my primary research examples. | The student clearly indicates what this paragraph is about. This shows the | (f) |
| Marwick (2014:115) describes micro-celebrity as “a way of thinking of oneself as a celebrity, and treating others accordingly.” | The author cites a reliable source[[2]](#footnote-2) to define the term ‘micro-celebrity’. The author adopts the form of integral citation and conforms to the style required for this work. | (c)  (f) |
| They are in-between of a non-famous person and a traditional celebrity. Rather than be awarded the title of a celebrity, a microcelebrity is self-proclaimed, and strategically attempts to construct themself as someone of fame and importance. | Rather than simply providing a definition from Marwick, the author elaborates on what the term means. | (b)  (f) |
| The concept of the micro-celebrity is something that has been made possible by Web 2.0 and social media platforms, as social media allow individuals to act out any portrayal that they wish. | The author links this to the topic of this dissertation, Web 2.0: identity and Self-exploration. The subordinate clause (second half of the sentence) provides a justification of focusing on the social media. | (b)/(d)  (f) |
| Primary examples from young traditional celebrities are widely available; however, because of their celebrity status, public accessible information about their life and how they explore and construct their identity may be distorted, therefore making them a biased and flawed example of the identity formation period for the average young person. | The author presents the first justification of choosing micro-celebrities to be researched. Here she discusses the pros and cons of researching well-known celebrities and argues about the disadvantage outweighing the advantage.  The transition marker[[3]](#footnote-3) *however* also clearly indicates the connection and relationship between the first part and the second part of the sentence. | (b)/(d)  (f) |
| On the other hand, it is challenging to find examples from a ‘normal’ young person, without referring to people that I know. Micro-celebrities are thus ideal primary research examples as they are known enough for me to look up their public social media profiles without the need of consent. | The author presents the second justification of choosing micro-celebrities to be researched. Here she discusses another potential candidate of investigation, ordinary people, and argues about the unsuitability of them by considering consent and confidentiality.  The transition markers *on the other hands* and *thus* show discoursal functions of ‘comparison’ and ‘consequence’. | (b)/(d)  (f) |
| Furthermore, as photographs uploaded to social media can be a key signifier of how they identify themself and wish to be viewed, in this research I am going to use images from the social media profiles of some micro-celebrities. | The author presents the third justification of choosing micro-celebrities to be researched. Here she implicitly refers to semiotics by arguing about the relationship between images posted by micro-celebrities to social media and how they would like to be seen from the images.  The use of *furthermore* indicates ‘addition’ to the existing argument. | (b)/(d)  (f) |
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