

The main problem with this paper was my limited use of genre theory to qualify my claims about ISUE as a discourse community. The structure of the paper was solid, and the basic level of genre analysis was there. I only needed to fix several writing style choices and define certain terminologies that were missing from the initial draft.

Following the recommendations from my professor, I regrouped how I introduced my primary research target, ISUE, and described it as a discourse community, rather than a research group. That allowed me to easily segue into a brief definition of discourse communities. The phrasing I used allowed me to follow that up with Carolyn Miller's description of a genre, in the context of genre theory. I felt like this lends itself well to the introduction section of the paper and gives the audience a clearer understanding of the theoretical materials needed throughout the text.

Another area where I improved the paper was in my second use of Miller as a reference. It was in the section of the paper related to ISUE's use of weekly meetings as genre. I initially had a paraphrased idea, which was hard to trace back to Miller. I replaced it with a more fitting quote that ended up better expressing what I was trying to convey, while simultaneously offering a more clear link to Miller and her expertise in genre theory.

The notes I received about my poor secondary source usage after the initial submission of this paper gave me a clear understanding of what my pitfalls are, pertaining to writing. I began conceptualizing how my claims might lead into one another and structuring my papers to revolve around expository citation use.