

## ■ GUIDELINES FOR PEER REVIEWS ■

Instructions for peer reviews are provided in Chapter 18 (pp. 490–496).

### For the Writer

Prepare two or three questions you would like your peer reviewer to address while responding to your draft. The questions can focus on some aspect of your draft that you are uncertain about, on one or more sections where you particularly seek help or advice, on some feature that you particularly like about your draft, or on some part you especially wrestled with. Write out your questions and give them to your peer reviewer along with your draft.

### For the Reviewer

- I. Read the draft at a normal reading speed from beginning to end. As you read, do the following:
  - A. Place a wavy line in the margin next to any passages that you find confusing, that contain something that doesn't seem to fit, or that otherwise slow down your reading.
  - B. Place a "Good!" in the margin next to any passages where you think the writing is particularly strong or interesting.
- II. Read the draft again slowly and answer the following questions by writing brief explanations of your answers.
  - A. Posing the problem:
    1. How might the title be improved to identify the problem more accurately or to better engage your interest?
    2. How has the writer tried to show that the problem is interesting, problematic, and significant? How could the writer engage you more fully with the initial problem?
    3. How does the writer provide cues that the writer's purpose is to explore a question rather than argue a thesis? How might the opening section of the paper be improved?
  - B. Narrating the exploration:
    1. Is the body of the paper organized chronologically so that you see the gradual development of the writer's thinking? Where does the writer provide chronological transitions? Are there confusing shifts from past tense to present tense? If so, how might the chronological structure of the paper be made clearer?
    2. How has the writer revealed the stages or changes in his or her thinking about the problem?
    3. Part of an exploratory paper involves summarizing the argument of each new research source. Where in this draft is a summary of a source particularly clear and well developed? Where are summary passages that seem undeveloped or unclear? How could these passages be improved?

4. Another part of an exploratory paper involves the writer's strong response to each source—evidence of the writer's own critical thinking and questioning. Where are the writer's own ideas particularly strong and effective? Where are the writer's own ideas undeveloped or weak? What additional ideas or perspectives do you think the writer should consider?
  5. Has the writer done enough research to explore the problem? Can you make suggestions for further research?
  6. How might the ending of the paper better sum up the evolution of the writer's thinking or better clarify why the writer has or has not resolved the problem?
- C. If the writer has prepared questions for you, respond to his or her inquiries.
- D. Sum up what you see as the chief strengths and problem areas of this draft:
1. Strengths
  2. Problem areas
- III. Read the draft one more time. Place a check mark in the margin wherever you notice problems in grammar, spelling, or mechanics (one check mark per problem).