

Nikola Koziol

Mary Hays

Reflection CR#2

9 December 2015

Reflecting on Critical Response 2

I analyzed three important writing tactics in this essay. After experiencing a full semester of Rhetoric 105, I took the advice more seriously. After writing a research paper, I realized, shitty drafts, interesting topics, and source annotations were the key to a successful paper. If I had not done one of these steps, then my essay would not have been as successful. Now, I will implement these steps into my writing process even if a teacher does not encourage these steps.

Although I value this advice more, the analysis of my paper has not changed drastically. In the introduction, I only removed “there are,” an expletive, from the first sentence to improve my grammar and make my essay more concise.

In the second paragraph, I added an in-text citation for the first source to avoid plagiarism. Then I added a sentence to clarify my analysis of Lamott’s use of God in her essay.

In the third paragraph I added in-text citation for the second source to avoid plagiarism. I added two sentences directly after the in-text citation to explain why Bradbury’s interview is casual. I made these same changes in the following paragraph.

The content was not changed more because my professor noted that she enjoyed my essay. This revision stressed the importance of citation usage and concise writing. Citations are helpful, visual indications of my analysis. If no sentences follow an in-text citation, then I know I

have not done any analysis. In addition, concise writing strengthens an analysis. I was able to implement expletive rules for the first time to form shorter sentences. I was able to practice the lessons I learned.