WR 100 N1/N2

Fall 2014

**Peer Review of Paper 1 Introduction Draft**

**Purpose:** Reading and critiquing the work of others benefits both the author and reader of a piece of writing. The author benefits by receiving an outside perspective, enabling him or her to improve his or her work through revision. The reader benefits by sharpening his or her editorial skills—skills that, later on, can be applied to the reader’s own work.

**Task:** Email a copy of your introduction to you assigned peer. Then read your peer’s introduction and respond to the questions below. When both you and your peer have had time to complete this sheet, email your comments and the marked up version of the introductions to each other. Finally, provide oral feedback.

**Logistical Matters:** Please type your comments on this Word doc and, where instructed, mark up your peer’s introduction.

In addition to emailing your work to your peer, you should post both your comments and your mark-up of your peer’s intro to your WordPress site: specifically, to a page titled “Review of Peer Intro Draft,” with “Paper 1” selected as the parent page.

After you have received your peer’s comments on your intro and his or her mark-up of your intro, post those documents to your WordPress site: specifically, to a page titled “Review of My Intro Draft,” with “Paper 1” selected as the parent page.

**Comments:** The benefits of this exercise can be realized only if you critique your peer’s work honestly. While you should be respectful, you should assume your peer is open-minded and more interested in writing to the best of her or his ability than in hearing empty praise.

Note: the aim of this peer review is *not* proofreading or sentence-level revision. Rather, your focus should be the overall structure of the introduction and the ideas expressed. Being a native or non-native English speaker has virtually no bearing on your ability to analyze introduction structure and ideas. That said, if you don’t understand the intended meaning of something your peer has written, you should ask him or her to explain.

**Your name:** *Yang Wang*

**Your peer’s name:** *Neel Doshi*

1. Does the intro break down into three parts (common ground/background, problem/destabilizer, and resolution/claim/thesis) or into four parts (common ground/background, problem condition/destabilizer, problem consequence/significance, and resolution /claim/thesis)? Three parts would be sufficient. Four would be ideal. On the intro, use the insert comment feature to precisely label the parts. When you provide your peer with spoken feedback, explain why you think the intro breaks down this way.

The intro breaks down into three parts.

1. Are all parts of the intro sufficiently detailed? Or would the reader be better prepared for the upcoming argument if he or she had additional information? Or is anything in the intro unnecessary or redundant?

All the parts of the intro explain the idea well. Reader does not need to have additional information to understand the argument better. Nothing is redundant but concise and clear.

1. Is the resolution /claim/thesis sufficiently *specific* and *narrow*? Test it in the following way. First, copy and paste the resolution /claim/thesis onto this sheet. Second, use the insert comment feature to highlight key terms. Third, in each comment bubble, try asking basic reportorial questions (who, what, why, when, where, how) about each key term.

In fact, one's idea of a healthy or balanced meal depends greatly on the cuisine of the region from where they originate as well as the information fed to them by education and media.

one: people around the world

Where: all the world

1. Is the resolution /claim/thesis *arguable* or *debatable*? Test it by reversing it. Type the reversed resolution /claim/thesis on this sheet. If the reversed claim is false or trivial, then your peer’s claim isn’t arguable. Explain why you think your peer’s claim is or isn’t arguable. (Note: you don’t need to reverse every grammatical part of the claim, just its essential meaning. For example, the reverse of “cats are nice pets” isn’t “pets nice are cats”; rather, it’s “cats are not nice pets.”)

Reversed Claim: People's idea of a healthy meal comes from common sense but not from their regional cuisine or the education and media.

This sentence does not seem to be false because some people always eat junk food but they still know what the healthy food should be (Ex, from food pyramid). I think many people would hold the same opinion about what a healthy meal is because food pyramid is approved all over the world, and people may tend to believe in science so they probably have the same idea. So the claim is arguable.

1. Overall, how does the intro strike you? Is it clear? Does it pique your interest?

Yes it is clear. It lets me consider about if it is true that people's idea of a healthy meal comes from their traditional cuisine and their education and media.

The food pyramid is a great tool one can use to make sure he or she practices eating a balanced meal in their daily lives. It splits the food into 5 different groups of vegetables, fruits, oils, dairy, and protein. When asked about their thoughts of a balanced meal, the average American will reference the food pyramid and respond that a balanced meal would consist mostly of fruits and vegetables and a more modest portion of the other three food groups. However, this idea of a balanced diet is not consistent throughout the rest of the world. Why is it that different places have different ideas of the components of a balanced meal and what causes these differences in opinion? In fact, one's idea of a healthy or balanced meal depends greatly on the cuisine of the region from where they originate as well as the information fed to them by education and media.