

## Informative/Research Essay Peer Review Workshop

**Directions:** Read through your partner's essay twice. The first time familiarize yourself with the topic of the essay. The second time, read for the essentials we discussed in class: the qualities of good writing, as well as effective argumentation strategies and requirements. Mark the essay as you read and add questions or comments on the writing (see also GENERAL CHECKLIST FOR ESSAYS). Then, please answer the following questions as completely as possible. Do not just give the paper and writer the stamp of approval, or a "yes" or "no" answer - you will be doing your partner a disservice. When you are done, discourse with your peer about their essay and your comments. Feel free to ask questions and/or clarify any issues you may have had reading their essays.

### **INTRODUCTION (hook, general background on topic and specific 2-3 part thesis)**

1. Does the *title* grab your interest? Why? Does it suggest the essay's topic? If there isn't a *title*, make suggestions for one and discuss with you peer.
2. Does the essay start with interesting and/or relevant *hooks*? What types of *hooks* are used? Are the *hooks* effective? Why or why not?
3. Does the *introduction* provide *background* information on the *topic* that moves from the *general* to the *specific*? Suggest *revisions* and/or complement below:
4. Underline the *thesis*. Does it contain at least 2 or 3 points? Is the thesis the LAST SENTENCE in the *introduction*? Suggest *revisions* and/or complement below:

### **BODY (topic sentence, support w/reasons/facts/evidence from sources—parenthetically cited)**

5. Read the *topic sentences* of each body paragraph. Does each contain a focused statement about the contents of the paragraph? Do the *topics sentences* connect to the *thesis*?
6. Was the *topic sentence* either hinted at or stated in the *introduction/thesis*? Suggest *revisions* and/or complement below:

7. Is the writer's *support* logically presented? Is the paper developed enough? Suggest *revisions* and/or complement below:
8. Does the *essay* include four credible, outside *sources*? What are they? List them below.
- 1.
  - 2.
  - 3.
  - 4.
9. Are the outside sources documented correctly according to proper MLA in-text documentation standards (parenthetical citations)? Suggest *revisions* and/or complement below:
10. Does the writer integrate quotes well? Does s/he vary the mode of integration? Use your quote integration handout to check.

**CONCLUSION (reword main claim and reasons & other summary strategies: quote, anecdote, prediction, solution, etc...)**

11. Does the *conclusion* remind the reader of the writer's main points? Suggest *revisions* and/or complement below:
12. Does the writer offer a final thought, solution, prediction, or warning? If not, what strategies does the author use to conclude? Suggest revisions and/or complement below:

**STYLE (transitions, diction, syntax)**

---

13. Does the writer have appropriate *transitional words*, phrases and sentences? Mark them on the draft. Note any place that needs a transition or has an inappropriate or ineffective one. Also, does the writer use a variety of *transitions*?
14. *Diction*—Does the writer use any informal words or phrases (slang, colloquialisms) that are not academic/formal? Does the writer use jargon that needs to be explained? Does the writer use clichés? Highlight them and suggest revisions below:
15. *Syntax*—Does the writer vary sentence structure? Are there too many short, choppy sentences, or ones that are overly complex and need to be broken up? How do the sentences flow into one another? Do you find any places where it seems that author deliberately has manipulated the organization of his/her sentences to enhance this sense of flow?