Margrete Rolighed Xie
AU ID: 201705742
Number of characters: 3655

My writing process and feedback from peers

In my 3-page draft synopsis I started out by introducing to my entry – Tags in metadata. It felt like my goal for the introductory was to convince the reader that this was an interesting topic that could open many different discussions. I managed to outline what tags and tagging is, touch upon how tagging is something deeply rooted in our human nature and at the end introduce some of the issues and consequences of tags and metadata. My peers told me that they were intrigued by the topic and that I explained it all very well. I would say that my writing strengths are in telling things in the right order and in short precise sentences so that both the reader and myself get a good overview of the topic and sees a red thread through it all.

Something I found hard in my writing process was to find the right words. I think it's important to use more precise words to express yourself in order to make stronger and clearer explanations or arguments. I wish I had a bigger and more professional vocabulary, but I'm sure that'll come with time and with the practice of reading and writing.

Most of the feedbacks I got from my peers were their immediate associations of the topic and some possible answers to the questions I've listed in my 3-page draft. We had a long talk about how we thought about tagging differently. When they think of tags and tagging, they think immediately about hashtags and social tagging on Facebook, Twitter or Instagram. But what I wanted to focus on was tags in a wider sense, like metadata on websites and tags as a business model for many companies. But hearing their take on social tagging and its possible consequences I would consider including it in my synopsis, though still not as a main focus maybe just a side note to open a small discussion.

Another thing I got out of the feedback session were a few suggestions on specific examples from real life I could use. One of them I found particular interest in is the new social media platform called *Vero*. This platform is subscription-based and therefore promises to give the users *true social*. No more personal algorithms and metadata that's been sold around the world, but on Vero the users are customers, not advertisers. The popularity of this platform also reminded me of the newest hashtag trend "#deleteme" which started after the case of Cambridge Analytica, which is something I'm also considering including in my final synopsis.

Something I'm concerned about – and also something my peers warned me about – is that I have too many different perspectives on the subject. I should narrow it down in order to maintain focus on my main points and arguments. But on the other hand, it's reassuring that I have that many ideas so that I'm never going to worry about running out of things to write. And having many ideas also opens up for a broader reflection because I can then perspectivate to different fields and other topics.

This little exercise of reflecting on our peer-feedbacks and our writing process was really good to sort the different feedbacks and to spell out and elaborate the feedbacks that were important to my future writing. It was also nice to discuss our different perspectives on the subject with my peers to get a sense of what they thought could be interesting and relevant to write about. It's generally nice to have somebody else than yourself to read what you've written, because sometimes you can end up narrowminded when working alone on some paper. This is definitely something I would take with me in future writing in order to get more eyes and different angles on the subject of matter.