

Reviewer Information

Include the writer's name and email address, and the reviewer's (your) name and email address.

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?

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

Negative comments on posts in r/listentothis are by a loud minority and become the top-rated comments. This loud minority is mostly composed of self-proclaimed music critics who sometimes do not fairly judge the song(s) creating a prejudice. This results in confusion of whether or not the song is actually good.

Based only on signposts---the first 1-2 sentences in each paragraph---restate the sub-claims in the Results, Analysis, and Discussion sections, as you understand it. (Since the Results section is just your observations, consider whether the signposts hint at why the information is relevant to the claim.) *

Results- Critics often argue among themselves over ideologies in the comment section. Some posts with extremely talented artists are criticized over small insignificant things. The silent majority only upvotes songs and does not leave comments.

Analysis- Critics have pretentiousness in their comments. A highly upvoted post about a talented guitar player was mocked because she was playing music in the math rock genre. Connotations between media culture and comments of the critics of r/listentothis exist. Self-proclaimed music critics do not actually critique the music. Cancel culture is similar to the self-proclaimed music critics in r/listentothis. Twitter stans of cancel culture have a twisted sense of activism.

Discussion- Too much criticism can lead to the downfall of a community.

Does the Introduction include information about the subreddit itself (identifying details, background information, relevant statistics like membership numbers or frequency of posting, etc.) and the writer's controlling idea? *

Yes

No

If not, what information do you as a reader need before proceeding with the rest of the essay?

*

Introduction section was specific and clear.

Does the Methods section include how and how long the observations were conducted
without including the observations themselves? *

Yes

No

Do the observations listed in the Results section cue you, the reader, into what details are most significant to and will be analyzed in subsequent sections? *

Yes

No

In the Analysis section, if you highlight lines that indicate the writer's interpretation of primary research in one color, and then highlight lines that use secondary sources in another color, is it evident that the writer has a 50/50 balance of interpretation and research, *or* prioritizes the use of sources? *

Yes

No

Does the Discussion section address the larger implications of the writer's controlling idea, to online spaces or forms of interaction outside of the subreddit? *

Yes

No

After reading the essay, what details in the primary research and secondary research strike you as the most exemplary evidence of the writer's claim? How would you analyze these details? *

Cancel culture and how that applies to r/listentothis, what an actual critic does (not just reacts), outside culture can affect negative comments on posts.

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	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Woohoo!

Which assignment parameters are absent from the draft? (You may want to refer to the guidelines to be sure.) If none are absent, which need work? *

None of the basic parameters are missing. But the writer can work on the discussion section. Are there any online communities where less negativity would be beneficial, like on Twitter? Any social media platforms with only constructive criticism? possible negative effects of negative criticism?

On a scale from 1 to 5, how effectively is primary research being interpreted? *

	1	2	3	4	5	
Needs Work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Woohoo!

Explain why you gave the rating above. *

is there a reason why moderators of the subreddit do not take down negative comments that do not reflect the quality of the music itself? What are the connotations between the gaming communities and the r/listentothis subreddit?

On a scale from 1 to 5, how effectively is secondary research being summarized and applied? *

	1	2	3	4	5	
Needs Work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Woohoo!

Explain why you gave the rating above. *

The secondary evidence was unusually strong. The writer was able to explain why members of r/listentothis are not actual critics and the effects of cancel culture on Twitter (its relation to the subreddit and the differences).

On a scale from 1 to 5, how effectively is the controlling idea supported and explored through primary and secondary research? *

	1	2	3	4	5	
Needs Work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Woohoo!

Explain why you gave the rating above. *

You could possibly mention possible negative effects (for the specific community) that may result from unnecessary criticisms, but if this does not apply here then your controlling idea is good as is.

Are the writer's secondary sources: *

- Scholarly articles published in scholarly journals found using the Pace library database or Google Scholar, or articles taken from established, reputable popular magazines or news periodicals?
- Obviously obtained through Google and therefore non-reputable sources?
- Sources that pass the CRAAP test? (You may want to refer to the Vetting Sources Worksheet or the Library Instruction Tutorial if you need a refresher on CRAAP.)
- Summarized in accordance with the Concisely Summarizing Sources blog post?
- Applied to the writer's primary research through paralleling the writer's interpretations with ideas and assertions in the secondary sources?
- Synthesized with other secondary sources in accordance with the Concisely Summarizing Sources blog post?

Is the longest section the Analysis section, the second longest the Results section, the third longest the Introduction section, and the shortest the Methods and Discussion sections? *

Yes

No

If you answered "No" to the above, how would you advise the writer to reorganize their essay? *

The organization is as described above

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.
- Analytical. 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.
- 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 threads the writer is examining, such as specific community interests, member interactions, and discourse.
- Research-Oriented. Secondary research is clearly applicable to the concrete details the writer offers in their primary research.

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)? *

Option 1

How could the writer address any issues in their inclusion of secondary research? If it were you, what would you do? *

Top three tasks-

1. Edit discussion section
2. Grammar editing
3. maybe adding a few sentences of primary analysis and deleting sentences with obvious ideas.

There are no issues with secondary research.

How could the writer address any issues with connecting their secondary sources back to their primary research and controlling idea? If it were you, what would you do? *

As mentioned above, a few sentences of analysis added to the primary research may help connect both the primary and secondary sources back to the controlling idea a little bit better. (And deleting ones that point out the obvious and are not as analytical)

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

Honestly, this is a good essay. There are not too many issues with it, just simple editing changes.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms