

WRIT 120 – PEER REVIEW: Rhetorical Analysis Paper

Reviewer of the paper: _____

Writer of paper: _____

Instructions

- 1) Read all the questions below so you can be aware of what to look for as you read.
- 2) Read your peer's draft, making marginal notes with your word processor's comment features.
 - a. Note grammatical errors. (Try to identify the problem without fixing it for the writer.)
 - b. Note stylistic problems (e.g., lack of clarity) and successes (e.g., engaging phrases).
 - c. Ask critical questions or make critical observations from the perspectives of both believers and doubters. (Try to make at least one critical remark for each paragraph.)
- 3) After reading the whole paper, complete the rest of this document. *While you do not need to answer all the questions in each section, do try to give a paragraph of feedback in each area.*
- 4) E-mail the marked-up draft and this peer-review form to your classmate (CC-ing the instructor).

A. The grammar and style of writing should be formal, but engaging.

Is the writing style both clear and engaging?

Does the writer convey the proper academic voice (i.e., authoritative, objective, etc.)?

Do you see any recurrent grammatical or stylistic problems? (If so, what are they?)

What is the strongest paragraph in terms of style and clarity?

What is the weakest paragraph in terms of style and clarity?

B. The analytical thesis should make a comprehensive, compelling statement about the author's use of rhetorical appeals to achieve his or her purposes.

What is the paper's thesis? (If you can't identify it, tell the writer.)

Does the thesis and body of the paper focus on the rhetorical appeals and the rhetorical situation?

Does the thesis need demonstration or would most readers take it for granted? (Explain)

How might the thesis be made stronger (more detail, different emphasis, etc.)?

Does the paper provide an engaging introduction to the thesis? (How could it be improved?)

C. The organization and development of ideas should demonstrate the thesis.

- Are the key pieces of the overall thesis treated sufficiently in the body of the paper?
- Do the body paragraphs treat the rhetorical appeals in a cohesive, focused, and purposeful manner?
- Does the organization of the overall paper seem effective for supporting the analytical thesis?
- Are there any paragraphs that do not seem to relate to the analytical thesis?
- Does the conclusion discuss implications of the thesis (or just repeat key points from the body)?
- What are the strongest and weakest paragraphs in terms of ideas?

D. The source analyzed should be treated accurately, objectively, & sufficiently.

- Is the source treated with a balanced perspective (i.e., read from view of both skeptic & believer)?
- Does the analysis present a clear view of the rhetorical situation? (if not, what's missing?)
- Does the analysis consider all three rhetorical appeals sufficiently? (if not, what's missing?)
- Does the analysis make connections between specific rhetorical appeals and the rhetorical situation?
- Are analytical points sufficiently supported with textual evidence and explanatory reasoning?
- Does the analysis point out surprising omissions in rhetorical appeals or identify implied reasoning?

E. The formatting and documentation style should follow APA guidelines.

- Does the paper follow proper APA formatting guidelines? (If not, what is wrong?)
- Does the writer cite outside sources using proper APA in-text citation and quotation formatting?
- Is a References page provided at the end of the paper for every source cited in the body?
- Are the References entries properly formatted?
- Does the References page cite sources not used in the body of the paper?