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One of the challenges of college writing is incorporating research into argumentative essays and using that research as convincing evidence to support one’s arguments. Not only did Keara do a fantastic job of smoothly incorporating several scholarly sources into her own writing, she also explains who her research is coming from and why he or she is qualified to be speaking on that particular subject—in doing so, Keara adds legitimacy to those sources, which further strengthens their effectiveness. In addition, before getting too far into the paper, Keara provides a context for her readers, giving them pertinent background information to familiarize the reader with, for example, the theories she discusses throughout the rest of the paper. Another of her paper’s highlights is its clear organization and structure. She balances and effectively transitions from the general to the specific. It can be difficult in papers that switch from the broad to the specifics for the reader to keep track of which one the author is discussing, so one of the main areas we worked on during our session was clearing up a few ambiguities in the paper where it was unclear whether she was talking about children in general, for example, or the children who witnessed the Oklahoma City bombing. We also examined ways Keara could expand the section in which she talks about children healing adults, since that portion is small compared to the adults healing children section—doing so, as her final draft illustrates, gives the paper more balance and lends more support to the second part of her thesis. Overall, Keara’s paper is a fabulous example of a paper that contains a clear thesis, logical organization, good context, and effective transitions, as well as a paper that combines research and secondary sources with in-depth analysis to construct a convincing argument.