

APPENDIX. SAMPLE OF PEER REVIEW HANDOUT

This appendix includes part of the peer review handout referred to in the reflection above. Examples (in italics) and explanations of the guiding questions from the handout that address the features of specificity, focus, awareness, attention and intention are provided below.

Specificity:

Introduction, Q4

- *Is the rationale for the study clearly stated and convincing in terms of its significance (with the limited scope of the study in mind)?*

The part of the question in brackets reminds students that the study they are attempting is done on a small-scale and should be taken into consideration when assessing the clarity and persuasiveness of the study's rationale. This makes the question **specific** for the context of this study.

Focus:

Overall, Q16

- *Whenever a claim is made, is there adequate evidence to back the claim up? Is the link between the evidence and the claim (warrant) well explained?*

This question helps to provide **focus** as it makes specific reference to the model of argumentation that had been taught to students in class (Toulmin's model) via the usage of terms like 'claim', 'warrant' and 'evidence' that are used as part of Toulmin's model.

Awareness and Attention:

Introduction, Q6

- *Pay attention to what the question/problem states will be done by the study and keep this objective in mind as you read the rest of your peer's paper to see if the study answers/addresses the research question/problem.*

This question helps make students **aware** of, and **attentive** to the need to keep the study's research question and objective in mind as they read their peer's paper, which helps keep them focused on the overall aim of the study to ensure that its various sections are coherently linked.

Intention:

The 'Point + Suggestion' format referred to in the above reflection is put into practice in the 'Part 1 Individual Work: 1 hour 10 mins' section of the peer review handout (not shown below). Instructing students to follow this format helps to keep their review **intentional** as students would need to: (i) state the area for improvement in their own words, (ii) anchor it to the appropriate section in the draft and (iii) make a suggestion on how improvements can be made for their peer to implement.

UTW1001A Week 12 Tutorial 1: Peer Review – Paper 3

Table A:

CRITERION		Y	N	Maybe
INTRODUCTION				
1	Does the introduction contain relevant general description that helps lead into the specific topic of the study?			
2	Is the narrowing down of the focus to the specific topic of the study too abrupt?			
3	Is the rationale for the study, i.e. why has the study been done, clearly connected to the topic of the study mentioned previously in the introduction?			
4	Is the rationale for the study clearly stated and convincing in terms of its significance (with the limited scope of the study in mind)?			
5	Is there a clearly stated research question/problem? Are there any ambiguous terms in the question/problem?			
6	Pay attention to what the question/problem states will be done by the study and keep this objective in mind as you read the rest of your peer's paper to see if the study answers/addresses the research question/problem.			
DATA AND METHOD				
7a	Is there a brief, useful description of the data used for the study? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source of the data • Relevant description of subjects without using information that could potentially reveal their identities 			
7b	Is there any detail missing about the data that would be useful for the study?			
8a	Is the method used to collect and analyse the data described concisely in the paper?			
8b	Is there any detail missing that would be useful, in the context of the study, to understand the method better?			
ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION				
9	Does the analysis address the research question/problem?			
10	Is the analysis described and explained clearly, concisely and systematically?			
11	Is more analysis required or is the research question too broad?			
12	Are there clear and relevant references to extracts/figures when needed?			
13	Are the analytical findings linked to slightly broader themes, e.g. commodification, profit-loss rationality in the Discussion part of the paper?			
CONCLUSION				
14	Does the conclusion summarise what the study has achieved and linked this back to the research question/problem stated earlier?			
15	Is there a brief mention of the implications of this study in terms of how it can be expanded into a bigger study or how it sheds light on the specific topic in relation to the larger topic of neoliberalism as a whole?			
OVERALL				
16	Whenever a claim is made, is there adequate evidence to back the claim up? Is the link between the evidence and the claim (warrant) well explained?			

Reflecting on the Peer Review Process

CRITERION	Y	N	Maybe
17 With reference to the assignment requirements, are enough secondary sources used in the paper? (3 academic, peer-reviewed papers or 2 book chapters from academic sources)			
18 Are the secondary sources used relevant to the study? Do they add value where they've been used, e.g. by supporting claims or bringing in ideas relevant to the topic, method, analysis and discussion in the paper?			
19 Is there a Reference section which lists all the references used in writing up the study? Does this follow APA format?			
20 Does the paper flow coherently? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable cohesive devices used • Relevant and suitable links back to previous parts of the paper • Is there good sign-posting of what is to come in the paper? 			
21 Is the paper dependent on headings to signpost when it should be making use of cohesive devices, previews, etc.			
22 Are all the claims made in the study reasonable considering the size of the study?			
23 Are in-text citations well formatted according to APA format?			
24 Are quotations well-integrated into the text? Are they accompanied by in-text citations with page numbers?			
25 Is the presentation of the overall argument clear and systematic in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the introduction helps establish a basis for the study • Whether the description of the methods and data can be linked to the basis for the study, e.g. If it's stated that a social semiotic approach is adopted, then it's likely that the basis for the study will include description about semiotic resources and how these can be used to study the selected aspect of neoliberalism. • Whether the analysis provided addresses the research question/problem adequately. • Whether the discussion addresses relevant themes in the literature on neoliberal logic and is clearly linked to the analytical findings. • Whether the conclusion summarises what has been achieved in this essay with clear reference to the research question/problem and utilises this summary to point to how the study can be expanded or used to shed light on the specific topic in relation to the larger topic of neoliberalism as a whole 			
26a Has the word limit (1200-1500) been exceeded?			
26b Are there redundancies, e.g. repetition, that can potentially lead to the paper exceeding the word limit?			
26c Have some parts of the paper been underdeveloped such that the paper is less than the stated word limit?			