I disagree on your point about the use of “shat” in the first story. I don’t think you understand that “shat” is, in itself, a cuss word. It’s the past tense of “shit”, though Americans more often just use it for both tenses. It isn’t a surrogate word. If they were allowed, every middle school and Jr. High student would cuss in their essays. It’s unprofessional and shows a lack of vocabulary, so they aren’t allowed to do that. I also think the use of the in-laws’ names is a rather weak point to praise on, as saying “Kayla’s mom”, “Kayla’s stepdad”, “Kayla’s stepsister’s baby” would be too painful for even a grade-schooler to read. It was less good practice, and more absolutely necessary information. I do, however, on the over-repetition of vocabulary.

I agree that the second piece was far more informative than the first. I can’t see, however, how the first story “flowed through [your] brain easier”. It was a mess of repetitive language, exaggerated diction, and 20 lbs of brain goop melted from unnecessary details. But to each their own, I suppose.

Colby Saenthavy

I agree with a lot of what you have to say about the first story, but I also disagree with quite a bit. When I read the first narrative, I really felt like I was scrolling through a few pages of “That’s so relatable!” memes, as the stereotype of meeting the in-laws is mainstream enough for anyone to feel like they know how it feels. That’s heightened by how cliché’ the plot is. I do, however, strongly agree with you on the matters of David’s cliché and unrealistic representation and the exaggerated diction.

Your point on the title and first paragraph being misleading is interesting, and something I hadn’t thought about. After reading through the story a second time, I’ve come to agree with you. The actual plot of the story misaligns with the purpose of the story (explaining why the author chose computer science over biology). I had completely forgotten about the first paragraph by the end. I also agree completely on the vivid imagery provided in the piece. It likely made the story twice as engaging for me. I do have to disagree, however, that the detail of the science trip was a point against the story, as it helped show the nature of the author at that age and get the reader more in the mindset of the author’s age in the story, rather than letting it linger on the image of an adult that was established in the beginning. I found it to be an effective tool for visual transition.