Reviewer Information

Include the writer's name and email address, and the reviewer's (your) name and email address. PLEASE MAKE SURE TO ENTER NAMES AND EMAILS CORRECTLY.

Writer's Name *

Writer's Email Address *

Reviewer's (Your) Name *

Reviewer's (Your) Email Address *

Stage 1 - Describe!

Say what you see as a reader—that is, restate the writer's controlling idea and goals in your own words. What do you think the writer is trying to accomplish?

In the Introduction, which includes the controlling idea paragraph, the writer: *

○ Identifies and describes the basics of the community on a need-to-know basis for readers who are unfamiliar with it.

⦿ Identifies and describes a frequently recurring pattern of interaction, behavior, or social dynamic that will be analyzed in the essay.

○ Articulates a brief answer to the question, "How do I know what I know?" by linking the pattern to evidence from primary research, with the promise of further explanation later in the essay.

○ Hypothesizes a connection between the pattern of interaction, behavior, or social dynamic and a specific, non-obvious aspect about the community, such as demographic information or an unstated, implicit communal value

○ Reflects on why members of the community interact in this specific manner to enact or teach other members about that unstated communal value

What is the writer claiming? Restate the writer's controlling idea, as you understand it. *

There is a loud minority in r/listentothis that criticizes the artists and bashes their music as self-proclaimed critics. Negative comments on threads become the top-rated comments over positive comments, creating confusion among community members as to whether a song is really bad or good. This leads to unwanted prejudice against artists if users do not fairly judge the music.

If the controlling idea possesses any of the below characteristics, the writer should revise to create a more arguable claim. Is the writer's claim: *

☐ Too general? (That is, could it apply to any community at all, any group of people at all, any shared interest at all?)

☐ Too vague? (That is, could it apply to any behavior, interaction, or social dynamic in any community?)

☑ Obvious? (That is, does it state something that everyone knows or could reasonably guess, without needing to research the community or the social dynamic you're examining?)

☐ Unsubstantiated opinion? (That is, does it state something the writer "feels" that can't be supported or backed up except with more opinion?)

☐ A fact? (That is, does it state something that is known to be true and therefore doesn't need to be investigated?)

☐ Speculative? (That is, does it imagine motives that aren't grounded in concrete evidence from the visual artifact or from Redditor comments?)

Restate any sub-claims that might have been included in the Introduction, as you understand them. *

The self-proclaimed critics of the subreddit develop a toxic aspect of the community which occurs in the highest rated posts, and is therefore well-recieved by a larger audience.

Check all the criteria that the writer identifies in the Methods section. *

☑ Number of threads observed.

☐ The date/time each thread was observed.

☐ Length of each observation period.

☐ Method used to gather primary research (i.e., non-participant observation; participant observation; interviews; or another research method).

Identify information, if any, that does not belong in the Methods section (for instance, analysis and field notes should not be included under this subheading). *

I do not think any of the information included in the Methods section was completely unnecessary, however, the writer did not include several of the needed criteria for the Methods section, as noted above.

Does the Results section offer primary research on a need-to-know basis for readers to understand the claim, *without* yet interpreting the evidence? *

◉ Yes

◯ No

In brief, explain how you anticipate the evidence offered in the Results section will be linked back to the claim in the Analysis section. *

I think the writer will link his results to the Analysis section by explaining the effect of the negative comments on the music's popularity and audience.

What skills do you see the writer effectively trying out? What should they keep doing in future drafts? *

The writer's descriptions of the subreddit and threads analyzed are detailed and explanatory. There is no confusion for the reader.

Stage 2 - Evaluate!

Explain how the text meets or doesn't meet the assignment criteria. Consider also what you understand or don't understand, what you think meets or doesn't meet the goals of the assignment, and what seems missing or irrelevant.

On a scale from 1 to 5, how effectively does the writer address the basic parameters of the assignment? *

	1	2	3	4	5	
Needs Work	○	○	○	◉	○	Woohoo!

Which assignment parameters are absent from the draft? *

The methods section did not specify how the study was done, either through nonparticipant or participant observation. The results paragraph could have used more evidence, maybe a specific comment that illustrates the author's claim. The last paragraph of the introduction essay could be a little less general and more specific to the claim or relate to the claim. Currently, the details surrounding the claim are more descriptive than functional regarding the main points of the claim.

On a scale from 1 to 5, how effectively is the controlling idea (presented in ~1 paragraph in the Introduction section) tied to evidence (presented in the Results section)? *

	1	2	3	4	5	
Needs Work	○	○	◉	○	○	Woohoo!

How effectively has the writer included specific evidence in the primary research data, like exemplary exchanges, comment/reply patterns, or other online interactions that indicate how the writer got to the claim and any sub-claims? *

	1	2	3	4	5	
Needs Work	○	○	◉	○	○	Woohoo!

Explain why you gave the rating above. *

The writer was more general regarding the interactions among commenters, and did not provide specific exemplary exchanges or comment/reply patterns.

React to the potential you see in this draft by selecting all that apply: *

☐ Grounded. The writer's knowledge is clear, and the writer supports claims with evidence, not opinions.

☑ Worthwhile. The claims and sub-claims are interesting and non-obvious.

☑ Assertive. The controlling idea, and any sub-claims, are clear and direct, not timid or polarizing.

☑ Manageable. The claim can be fully explored and explained within the page limit.

☐ Specific. The controlling idea and any sub-claims and evidence are linked to concrete details about the subreddit and the interactions and exchanges that make up the social dynamic most exemplary of onsite behavior.

☐ Creative. The writer demonstrates "outside the box" thinking and tries to think critically and creatively about the evidence at hand instead of repeating what they think they're "supposed" to conclude.

Stage 3 - Suggest!

Simply saying "This is good" or "I like this" might help you preserve relationships with people and make writers feel good about themselves, but they don't drive more effective revisions. Offer concrete advice for improvement by describing, ghost-writing, anticipating roadblocks. Essentially, what can change in the draft to make it stronger?

What are the top three tasks you would prioritize for this writer to work on between now and the due date for the essay (Friday at 5pm)? *

1. Specifying the results section. Adding specific exemplary exchanges between commenters that support your claim.
2. Addressing the method of observation you used (participant v. nonparticipant observation)
3. Specifying the sentences around your controlling idea, to make a stronger controlling idea.

How could the writer address any issues in their controlling idea paragraph and Introduction section? If it were you, what would you do? *

I would try to provide more specific sentences supporting the controlling idea to make the controlling idea stronger.

How could the writer address any issues in their Methods section? If it were you, what would you do? *

To address issues in the methods section, the writer should focus on the type of observation he conducted, length of each observation period, and date/time each thread was observed.

How could the writer address any issues in their Results section? If it were you, what would you do? *

To address issues in the results section, the writer can add exemplary comments and exchanges between group members to support the controlling idea.

What potential issues do you foresee for the Analysis and Discussion sections? If it were you, what would you do change at this stage of drafting to prevent these issues from coming up at a later stage? *

I do not think I see any potential future issues at this point, however the changes I mentioned are critical for the Analysis and Discussion sections. Also, it may be difficult to find examples of support for prejudice against music artists if you do not identify the type of musician facing the prejudices or the types of commenters giving out the comments.

What are any final comments you'd like to make that the rest of this peer review form doesn't address? *

Even though there are a few changes that need to be made, your essay is on the right track. Your subreddit has alot of information that can definitely be utilized and included in this essay to make it stronger.