Peer review of an argumentative text (column or editorial)

Done with the first version, before making changes to it. (30-45 min + discussion)

Writer:

Reader:

1. Read the text. What is the topic of the text?
2. The contents and language (choose the best alternative):
3. Check the references to other sources (the use of multiple voices).
The references have been done *clearly and well / sometimes poorly / not at all.*

b) The writer’s personality (keep the genre in mind!)

- The writer uses his / her own experiences and opinions *in an interesting way / quite often / not that much /not at all.*

*-*The writer *is very convincing / shows good knowledge on the topic / seems a bit unsure of his/her opinion.*
- The language is *good and clear / quite personal* journalistic style.

1. The structure of the text:

Point out the main point of every paragraph. Is the organization logical? Why or why not?

How does the writer start the text?

How does the writer end the text?

How good is the headline? It should reveal at least something of the thesis and be attractive to the reader. Explain your opinion.

1. Point out the arguments. What is the thesis, the most important statement of the text? (In your own words!)

After answering all the questions, discuss the thesis with the writer. Show the writer the markings you have made in the text and tell how they made you to interpret the thesis. If the thesis is not what the writer meant, try to plan how to make it clearer – how should the text be changed?

1. The best thing in the text was

A proposition for elaboration of the text:

Give these papers to the teacher at the end.