What are the **essential** moves/elements in a review?

Below are the ideas we brainstormed in class on 26th Feb. The moves/elements/stages are NOT intended as a strict/restrictive way to structure a review. The various elements may come in a different order, or be intertwined.

This list is merely to help you better understand the questions on the following page which you will use for your peer review.

**Context a – Text:** Website, Review, European Institute (**not explicit** but affecting text to a greater or lesser extent)

**Context b – Content**: Lecture, Speaker Bio data, Date, Audience, Where? (**Explicit** and in some detail, referred to throughout the text)

**Topic:** Title, Overview/Background, Key terms/definitions, Expansion, Examples, Main message, Conclusion

**Purpose(s) a** – of text/author of review (**implicit**)

**Purpose(s) b** – of who/what being reviewed.

**Critique:** Comments/criticism – both positive and negative, agreement/disagreement.

**Wrap up:** Closing (concluding) remarks (of reviewer) – leaving the reader something to think about

Other essential elements

**Review structure**: clear to follow with well defined paragraphs.

What are the **optional** moves in a review?

Background detail

Rhetorical Question
Quotations
Personal reactions
Idioms

By 28th Feb you should have received 3 reviews. For each of the reviews you receive from the members of your group, you should answer the questions in the Peer-Review form. Remember to list GOOD as well as weak points.

You should then send your peer-review forms to each respective author by Monday 3rd March.

You should also receive three forms for your own review. You should take these comments into account when editing/redrafting your own review which you will then submit to me by Friday 7th March.

**Peer-Review of a Review**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Comment(s)** |
| Q1. Does the review provide a clear context? |  |
| Q2. Is the topic of the review clear from the start and handled clearly in the main body of the review? |  |
| Q3. Is it clear what the purpose of the lecture is and does the lecture deliver this message? |  |
| Q4. Does the review comment on the lecture/provide a critique of the lecture? (whether positive or negative) |  |
| Q5. Does the review re-contextualise the lecture and does it end with a final thought provoking comment or final critique of the lecture? /  |  |
| Q6. Is it clear what the purpose of the review is and does the review achieve this purpose? |  |
| Q7. Were any rhetorical/linguistic devices used in the review? |  |
| Further comments  |  |
| Suggestions for improvement |  |