



Cornell University
College of Arts and Sciences

**John S. Knight Institute for
Writing in the Disciplines**
101 McGraw Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-4601
t: 607 255-2280
f: 607 255-2956
knight_intstitute@cornell.edu
www.arts.cornell.edu/knight_institute

Document Title: Peer Review / Conclusion Writing Exercise
Author: Hesselbein, Chris

Course: STS 1123
Course Title: Technology and Society: Living in a Technological World

Year of Award: Fall 2014

Copyright Statement:

This material is copyrighted by the author and made available through the Cornell University eCommons Digital Repository under a Creative Commons Attribution, Non-Commercial License.

This document is part of the John S. Knight Writing in the Disciplines First-Year Writing Seminar Program collection in Cornell's e-Commons Digital Repository.
<http://ecommons.library.cornell.edu/handle/1813/10813>

Winner

Fall 2014 Knight Award for Writing Exercises and Handouts

The Knight Award for Writing Exercises recognizes excellence in short exercises and/or handouts designed to improve student writing. Appropriate topics may be drawn from the whole range of writing issues, large scale to small scale, such as development of theses, use of secondary sources, organization of evidence, awareness of audience, attention to sentence patterns (e.g., passive/active voice; coordination/ subordination), attention to diction, uses of punctuation, attention to mechanics (e.g., manuscript formats, apostrophes). Exercises and handouts may be developed for use in or out of class.

Submissions should comprise three parts: (1) A copy of the handouts or instructions that go to students. (2) An explanation of the exercise/ handout and of the principles behind it, addressed to future instructors who may use the material. (3) If possible, an example of a student response.

Submissions may range in length from one to four or five pages.

Winning entries will be deposited in a web accessible archive and made available to other instructors under a creative commons attribution, non-commercial license. (See creativecommons.org for more information about cc licensing.)

To facilitate future searching of the Institute's archive, we ask that you provide a brief descriptive abstract (about 75 words) of your document, and a short list of appropriate keywords that might not appear in the text. Examples might include terms like "rhetorical situation," "style," "citation," etc. **Any borrowings such as quotations from course texts or handbooks must be cited properly in the document itself.**

The two winning entries will receive \$350; second place winners (if any) will receive \$125.

Submissions are due in 101 McGraw Hall by Friday, December 19. No exceptions can be made.

Fall 2014 Knight Award for Writing Exercises and Handouts

~Please Print Clearly. Do not staple. Use paper clips only~

Instructor's name CHRIS HESSELBEIN


Department STS Course # and title STS 1123 LIVING IN A TECHNOLOGICAL WORLD

Home telephone _____

Should I win a prize, I give the John S. Knight Institute permission to publish, quote from, and/or distribute copies of the writing exercises, and to distribute publicity to newspapers and other publications, local and/or national, about my winning the prize. I also grant the Knight Institute permission to deposit the writing exercises in a web accessible archive and make them available under a creative commons attribution, non-commercial license. I am prepared to send electronic versions of my text to Donna O'Hora (dlo1@cornell.edu) in the Knight Institute. I understand that I will receive the award for my prize-winning essay upon submission of the electronic text.

PEER REVIEW / CONCLUSION WRITING EXERCISE

Title of Writing Exercises

Instructor's signature  Date 12-18-14

Peer review / conclusion writing exercise:

Today's peer review exercise will be slightly different than usual. Please take one of the giant Post-It sheets I've provided and glue them over the conclusion of the hard copy of your essay. Make sure that your peer reviewer cannot see the conclusion to your paper. Exchange your essay with that of your peer reviewer.

Read the whole essay very carefully and pay special attention to the introduction. What is the argument put forward? How is this argument presented to the reader in the introduction? What is the evidence provided in the main body to support this argument? More importantly, what are the conclusions that can be drawn from both the introduction and the main body?

Write a conclusion to the essay you've just read. Try to be as specific and convincing as possible based on the argument put forward in the introduction and the evidence provided thereafter.

Once you're done writing your conclusion, remove the Post-It note and reread the entire essay but this time include the original conclusion. How does this conclusion differ from the conclusion you've written? How does the original conclusion match up with the introduction and main body of the text? Look for things that can be improved. The introduction might need to be more focused, or there might be relevant evidence missing in the main body. Also, are the conclusions warranted or could they be more sharply formulated?

When you're both done, return the essay to your peer and read the conclusion he or she has written to your essay. How does it differ from yours? Discuss the differences between the conclusion written by your peer and your own conclusion. Tell your peer how they can improve their conclusion. Again, be as specific as possible. Don't just point out the problem but also offer suggestions for how the problems might be remedied. Needless to say, listen carefully to your peer reviewer's comments and make sure to incorporate them in your next draft.

Rationale

This exercise is meant to achieve two things, namely to provide students with feedback from their peers and to allow them to practice and reflect on the writing of conclusions. Making students write a conclusion based on an essay written by one of their peers forces them to think about the structure that links introduction, main body, and conclusion together. If the transitions between these parts of the text are illogical or difficult to follow, it also becomes harder to write a conclusion. In my experience, a dull or irrelevant conclusion is often the result of problems that haven't been confronted earlier on in the introduction and the main body. Being asked to write a conclusion ensures that students are forced to confront the numerous difficulties that are frequently present in a first draft. Moreover, rather than asking students to simply point out the problems in a draft, writing an alternative conclusion drives students to point out to their peer that important evidence is missing or that their problem statement needs to be more focused. There is, of course, a chance that poor students will write similar conclusions or will be unable to locate the problems in a draft together. For this reason, I think it's a good idea to follow this exercise up with a discussion of the conclusion to a text that you've assigned for that day's class. Alternately, this follow-up exercise could also precede the peer review/conclusion writing exercise. However, I think that performing it as a follow-up exercise works better since students' interest will have been primed and they will be more motivated to learn from a good example.