

Contribution Peer Review Sheet

Use the spaces below to provide feedback for your peer (please forgive the formatting inconsistency once you get to “Style and Process”). Answer: How well has your peer completed each of these tasks in his/her/their paper? Are there points from the rubric that are absent or that need to be completed more fully? How would you recommend that your peer improve his/her/their paper? Has your peer done especially well on a certain point? Cite specific page numbers and locations so your peer can easily interpret your comments and critiques. Be both kind and honest in your criticism and praise. It’s not helpful to simply write “yes,” “no,” or “looks good;” rather, you should provide detailed and thoughtful feedback for your peer.

Content, Focus, and Development

The paper argues for a particular, reasonable thesis about a course text, speculative fiction, or culture that stems from careful analysis and utilizes a theoretical lens.	Yes, I can tell that the thesis is about the innateness of “identity” within <i>Annihilation</i> and how it contradicts what Butler and Appiah say about it,
The paper’s thesis is debatable and / or interpretable. It is new or it expands upon preexisting arguments in new ways.	Yes! It uniquely examines the nuances of how Butler’s and Appiah’s function with each other and uniquely shows how <i>Annihilation</i> is an exception to Appiah’s comments about authenticity. It is clearly debatable, as other people may claim that <i>Annihilation</i> aligns well with what Appiah says about identity.
The paper clearly defines the salient features of theoretical lens(es) utilized in the argument.	Yes, it defines the overall opinions of Appiah’s and Butler’s arguments and their viewpoints about performativity and authenticity. There are also other references to performativity that Appiah talks about that may be helpful, such as the waiter performing his role within society.
The paper explains significant historical, literary, or cultural background necessary for the understanding of the argument.	Outlining Appiah’s and Butler’s main arguments are the primary means of introducing the background information. I feel like other sources can be consulted to discuss the legitimacy of an innate self--there is a lot of history on the distinction between self and identity that I think you can check out!
The paper demonstrates an awareness of insider vs. common knowledge (e.g. by defining key terms and attributing information to outside sources).	The paper defines “performativity”, “authenticity”, “collective” identities, “self”. These terms are key to understanding the nuances discussed in the paper.
The paper explains the stakes: how the argument facilitates a new understanding (e.g. enhance, extend, critique / evaluate preexisting arguments).	It definitely underlines how this argument heightens our understanding of Appiah’s rejection of an authentic self. It doesn’t talk much about the application of the stakes (e.g. how it means for society) but I’m also not sure if that is within the scope of the paper.
The paper defines keywords and uses them in high-priority places (e.g. thesis, topic sentences) to	Refer to the comment about awareness of insider vs common knowledge. I feel like the same applies to

consistently to show explicit connections between the thesis and other points in the paper.	this; you talk about key terms within the lens and how it applies to <i>Annihilation</i> .
The paper uses information from at least four credible academic sources (see assignment guidelines).	There's still a while to go here, but I definitely think you can find sources that either heighten or go against your argument! Note: I'm not sure where this comment would go, but I thought your point about how racial and gender identities not mattering in the story provide another interesting nuance to an "authentic" self that is separate from these identities that are often used for performance within society.
The paper demonstrates strategic use of authoritative research, as relevant.	Same as above, as there are no other sources besides the theoretical lenses.
The paper contextualizes the argument within already existing perspectives (explains relevant theoretical lenses, converses with arguments from class sources and outside sources, recognizes broader cultural and rhetorical contexts and discourses that are pertinent to the paper, etc.).	Yes, this very clearly points out how it functions within the perspectives presented by Appiah and Butler, which are in turn perspectives functioning within the status quo of society. It is still missing the broader cultural and rhetorical contexts that would be supplemented by outside sources.
The paper uses relevant and sufficient evidence to develop its generalizations (e.g., details, examples, paraphrases and quotes from the text).	Yes, this source commands a thorough usage of the relevant quotes and sources from <i>Annihilation</i> . It also well quotes sources from Appiah and Butler. Again, it is missing quotations from outside sources beyond these two lenses that would contextualize it to a modern setting.
The paper makes central warrants or assumptions explicit for the reader.	Assumptions are not made explicit. Assumptions could include
The paper acknowledges alternative perspectives and converses with them or possibly entirely refutes them (i.e., it counters naysayers).	Naysayers are not explicitly brought up and countered.
Structure, Coherence, and Language	
The paper is structured with a thesis and a preview of the major points.	Yes, although the point about racial and gender identities came a bit out of no where.
The paper adheres to the structure laid out in the introductory preview.	No introductory preview, not applicable.
Paragraphs and ideas are organized so that their order progresses logically. There are transitions connecting paragraphs and sentences to each other and to the thesis/introduction.	Yes!!! I really like the way your argument flowed. You intelligently muse on the texts and present relevant ideas.
The paper has an abstract, introduction, subheadings, and conclusion that facilitate close reading <i>and</i> skimming and that showcase the paper's main ideas (the paper is organized using a thesis-driven structure or an IMRaD structure, as decided upon with instructor during drafting stages).	Missing abstract and introduction. The headings are good.
The paper uses language conventions and considerations of genre to craft writing that is an appropriate level of stylistic difficulty for the audience.	Yes, the language is very well written. I don't think there's much to improve on that facet.

<p>Style and Process</p> <p>The writer has completed and possibly reworked all smaller drafting assignments leading up to this larger draft (structure rationale, proposal, introductory preview).</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>The final draft incorporates feedback from peer review and the instructor. Revisions are substantive and considerate.</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Vocabulary and style are appropriate for academic writing. Attention has been paid to issues of standard written English. There are few, if any, errors; and no error causes difficulty for the reader's comprehension.</p> <p>Yes, vocab and style are appropriate.</p>
<p>The paper follows the MLA guidelines for formatting, in-text parenthetical citation, and a "Works Cited" page.</p> <p>May need page numbers? Not sure if this type of MLA needs it. Missing works cited.</p>
<p>Insight and Risk-Taking</p> <p>The paper demonstrates intellectual risk-taking through providing insight or approaching aspects of the task creatively.</p> <p>Yes, the paper picks up the audacious task of working against the theoretical lenses we analyzed in calss.</p>
<p>Abstract</p> <p>The abstract provides a concise and accurate preview of the contribution essay (possibly using "Novelty Moves").</p> <p>N/A</p>

