only five interviews appear here. And although these were apparently long interviews — between 30 and 90 minutes — some of the accounts of them are extremely short, as though there wasn't much content. I should add that these accounts are nicely written and interesting in themselves — especially the interview with C, which is full and beautifully composed with a mixture of quotations, paraphrases, and explanations. As the paper progresses they remain nicely composed, but get shorter, as though there was less and less to say.

I realize that this is a draft and that you probably had trouble figuring out how you could fit all this material coherently into a single paper. But when you get to the conclusions you also seem to dismiss that interview material as inconclusive, and turn back in the end to a "personal hypothesis" without reference to your data, suggesting that the whole question is confusing, unspecific to Koreans, and illogical.

Can you find patterns that allow you to use more of this rich material? If you can't, what happens if you think of inconsistency itself as a pattern, allowing you to present a greater variety of perspectives?

This example illustrates some of the following strategies for eliciting real revision.

Strategies in End Comments for Eliciting Revision

- *Describe rather than prescribe.* If you simply describe what the writers have and have not done in first drafts, they can often see gaps, contradictions, and alternatives as observations of their own that they can and should act upon. Prescriptive statements (*You need to revise your thesis*) represent *your* observations and incentives to revise.
- *Describe the experience of reading the draft.* Letting the writer know what is happening as you read can be a very efficient, effective way to stimulate revision without prescribing it. Such accounts of reading work especially well in the margins: *I could follow the argument easily to this point, but now I'm lost. I can't see how these conclusions follow from the examples above.*
- *Ask questions.* Whether in the margins or in final comments, questions function as little prybars that open the draft to further thought yet leave responsibility for finding answers with the writer. Many statements (*You need a transition here*) can be posed more effectively as questions (*What is the connection between the argument in this paragraph and the example in the next?*).

- *If possible, find the basis for revision in the draft itself.* Even very rough and undeveloped drafts usually contain some promising ideas and useful material for revision. Identifying these foundations for reconstruction allows students to retain a sense that this is their own work, with its own potential for improvement (*The most interesting argument appears in the middle of paragraph 6. What would happen if you restructure the paper around that idea?*).
- *Limit editorial and stylistic changes to examples and brief passages.* If there are problems of style and error running through the paper, simply point to a couple of examples or edit a single paragraph for illustration. Be sure that you choose sentences and paragraphs most likely to remain in the revised version. If you edit an introductory paragraph *and* suggest that the student write a new introduction, these messages will seem to conflict and the writer will probably retain the edited portions.
- *Don't be shy.* When teachers complain that students did not make serious revisions, we often find that their comments did not directly call for serious revision. In many cases, to avoid sounding discouraging they began with generous statements such as *On the whole, this paper works very well,* even when they saw major problems of logic and organization. Noting these problems on a finished paper might be read as condemnation, but on a draft they represent an opportunity to salvage the work. If your comments are evasive, you deprive writers of this opportunity.
- *Teach students to follow these same principles when responding to each other's drafts* (see "Methods for Structuring Peer Review"). Students respond with alacrity to instruction in how to comment effectively on each other's work, but they will need the following help: models (such as your own responses); definitive guidelines, preferably provided for each task of response in a handout; and practice — students will tend to avoid criticism the first couple of times. Such practice will help them learn to think more critically about the subject, and it will help them learn how to read and critique writing, a facility most will need throughout their careers and lives.

In-Class Work on Revision

Much of the discussion to this point has assumed that work on revision takes place primarily through individual essays submitted to instructors and comments returned to individual students or through individual conferences.

Sometimes, however, it may also be appropriate to address issues of revision with your entire class. Here are some methods for doing so, along with reasons for trying them.

Methods for Working on Revision in Class

- Bring in samples of revision (before-and-after models) to discuss. These can include samples from your own writing (students appreciate this); from students who are doing interesting, productive rewriting; or from published work (such as drafts of the Declaration of Independence). Students learn from concrete examples of what we mean by revision, and most are surprised at the radical changes characteristic of professionally revised prose.
- When you have returned a batch of drafts on which you've written comments, ask students to use the next 20 to 30 minutes to begin rewriting. Use this time to confer with individuals about what you meant and about what they might do.
- Ask students to bring all their essays to class. Then have them review all your comments and summarize, in writing (through lists and analysis), what they find. What are they good at? What mistakes or weaknesses appear most frequently? In what areas do they now need to work? This can be an excellent strategy if you believe students are not transferring the principles of your comments from one paper to the next. They may be surprised to find that you have repeatedly given the same advice. This activity could also take place at home; students then submit their written reports to you.

Methods for Structuring Peer Review

Peer review is an essential guide to revision in almost every field of academic publication. Because publishers do not entirely trust themselves (and scholars do not entirely trust them) to make independent decisions about the value and clarity of a manuscript, they request help from members of the intended audience. In turn, authors benefit from the advice offered by their peers, even if opinions of their work differ. Editors mediate these differences and negotiate productive changes to work in progress.

There are good reasons for extending the benefits of peer review to student writing:

- Like the editor of an article or a book, the teacher holds final authority over the revisions necessary to bring student writing to completion, but advice from the writer's peers can be very useful in this process.
- Like scholars, student writers learn from several views of their work in progress.
- Students appreciate the opportunity to read one another's responses to an assignment.
- As writers, they can also gain valuable skills from the challenge of helping other writers improve their drafts.

- The skills involved in peer review are valuable not just in the classroom, but also in most professions.

Yet teachers are often reluctant to include peer review, or often discontinue the practice, because the advice students offer one another can be shallow or misleading. Although they are the writer's peers, students are not experienced reviewers or experts in the subject of the work, and they are sometimes reluctant to offer advice that seems critical. Some student readers can be *too* critical and will feel obliged to "correct" writing that you, the teacher, consider fluent and effective. Monitoring these reviews and negotiating their differences can require more time than responding directly to drafts, without peer review.

It is certainly true that if you just ask students to review one another's drafts, without guidelines, the results will be inconsistent at best, especially on the first occasion. Some readers' comments will be confined to bland praise and empty generalization (*I thought this was a really good paper; It could be clearer in some places*). Other readers will try to correct specific phrases and sentences, ignoring general problems with organization and development. You might well conclude that the exercise was a waste of time.

Like the value of other teaching strategies, however, the value of peer review will depend on the way you structure and supervise the activity, in line with the design and goals of your class. Professional writing teachers who emphasize the writing process sometimes devote most of their class time to collaborative work on drafts, in pairs or small groups. These teachers gradually train their students to provide useful feedback at different stages of the writing process, and their students learn to assume responsibility for helping one another. From the repeated experience of giving and receiving comments, these students figure out which kinds of advice are most helpful, and they realize (as other writers do) that they can offer useful suggestions even if they struggle with their own writing projects. As students become more skillful at helping one another, peer review begins to repay the time and effort teachers spend in supervising this work. When student writers receive thoughtful, constructive suggestions from their peers, they will need less detailed commentary from their teachers.

Movement in the direction of independence from the teacher is not a dereliction of duty. Student writers *should* become less dependent on teachers and more reliant on themselves and their peers in the revision and evaluation of their work.

If you have time available for peer review in class, here are some basic requirements for making this work productive.

Suggestions for In-Class Peer Review

- Form *peer review groups of three or four*; these can work better than pairs because no one gets stuck with just one, possibly ineffective or irresponsible, reviewer. If there is insufficient time for multiple readers, have students work in pairs.

- Decide whether you want to let students determine *who will read* their drafts or if you want to choose readers for yourself. If the latter, prepare the list of who will exchange with whom in advance.
- Make sure that students bring the necessary *multiple copies of their drafts* to class for distribution to the peer readers.
- Distribute *clear, written instructions* for the kind of feedback you want reviewers to provide at that stage of the process — for instance, attention to general organization and development in an early draft, qualities of evidence and other support for an argument, revision of sentences in a work that is nearly finished. It makes good sense to provide precise lists of questions the reviewers should answer or, perhaps better yet, forms they should fill out.
- If you do not use *review forms*, tell students to *write comments on the draft*, including general comments at the end.
- Make sure the students have *time in class to discuss these comments* with each other to clarify lingering questions. If all the work is done in class, schedule ample time.
- *Be on hand* to provide assistance and resolve doubts while the students are working together in class.
- Remind students of *collegiality* — that they should provide the kinds of help they would like to receive from others.
- *Repeat these exercises* as frequently as you can throughout the term. With practice, students will become more skillful at providing and utilizing peer reviews.

Out-of-Class Peer Review

In topical courses that include writing assignments, you might not have time available for peer review in class, but these exercises also work very well outside class, much as they do in the professional review of manuscripts. In fact, some teachers use professional models for peer review in their fields, especially in advanced courses where majors become familiar with professional literature. In advanced laboratory science courses, for example, teachers sometimes organize anonymous student peer reviews of lab report drafts, according to professional guidelines, and serve as the "editors" for these manuscripts. When the student authors have received the reviews, they write letters addressed to the editor, thanking the reviewers and explaining how they plan to implement the advice in a revised report. This letter, for which most science teachers can provide models, serves as a contract or promise for making changes, which the teacher can further negotiate if necessary.

If professional models and anonymous reviews seem inappropriate for your course, you can shift most features of an in-class peer review to out-of-class activities to ensure productive work.

Suggestions for Out-of-Class Peer Review

- Require students to bring sufficient *copies* of their drafts to exchange in class.
- Distribute written review *guidelines* or forms.
- Set a *deadline* for submission of peer reviews.
- Ask that students write comments directly on the essay, fill out the form you provide, or, better yet, type up a *review letter*, following the guidelines you provide.
- Provide *time in class for students to discuss these comments* with one another, to clarify lingering questions.
- Again, *repeat* this exercise as frequently as you can throughout the term.

Like journal editors, you will need to monitor these reviews to some extent; many teachers want to see all of the peer comments before they compose their own responses to drafts. If peer review is an important part of the course, the quality of these reviews may constitute part of the final grade as well.

Although it involves more paper, along with some delay, one strategy is to ask all of the reviewers to submit copies of their comments to you. Teachers who want to avoid this additional paperwork and delay structure all or parts of the peer review process as electronic exchange. Students can exchange drafts as e-mail attachments and exchange their general comments in e-mail messages, copied to you. For sentence-level and marginal comments on work that is nearly finished, they can insert suggestions in the texts and return them as attachments. Even with these electronic exchanges, however, it is a good idea for student writers to meet to discuss the drafts. These interpersonal contacts almost always raise new issues and resolve misunderstandings.

> More than any other teaching practice, peer review can help students view their writing as a malleable substance that they can shape and reshape with the help of attentive readers before they submit their work to you, the final judge of its quality. The tendency for student writing to set up prematurely, like poured concrete, results in part from the sense that the first reader of this work will be its grader. Peer review delays that moment of submission and thus extends the time when writing remains a creative process, open to substantial revision.