Dear Susan:

I think you’ve done a good job of capturing the essence of each researcher’s beliefs/conclusions. You’ve also chosen a very straightforward organization that makes the dialogue component of this assignment very clear.

Here are a few suggestions for you to consider as you revise your paper:

1. **Assignment and balance:** I would suggest devoting more space to Parker and Posey’s response to the Redford article, instead of just focusing on your summary of Parker and Poseys’ academic positions. Professor Naughton clearly articulated her desire for you to consider carefully how both Parker and Posey would react to Redford’s piece. For example, I can’t tell from your paper whether you think Parker and Posey hold the same academic position or would respond differently to Redford’s article. Would Parker and Posey have mixed reactions? Is there anything else about the Redford article that is important to note? Can you offer more analysis of Reford’s ideas, instead of summarizing them?

2. **Paragraph structure:** It’s important that each paragraph of your paper be structured as well as the paper itself. I’ve noted several instances where a paragraph seems to contain a number of ideas that don’t come together as one cohesive thought (p. 2, par. 3; p. 3, par. 1). Topic sentences are useful in academic papers; you’ve used them effectively in several instances, which I’ve noted. For example, the second paragraph on p. 4: I know from your topic sentence that this paragraph is about the writer’s credibility as a researcher, and I read the rest of the paragraph to find out more about that topic. I encourage you to read through your paper and see where you can revise topic sentences so that they are strong throughout.

I’ve also noted some grammatical issues that are not too prevalent but probably worthy of minute or two’s attention during the conference. Please ask me about any comments that you don’t understand or need help with.

See you in conference!