

**Bill Wolff**

**Core 2: Research Methods for Writers, Spring 2013**

**Harper's Annotation Peer Response Instructions**

This peer response will involve close readings of the annotations and query/submission letter. Each student will respond to two one classmate. The goal is for you to be able to compose the tightest and most meaningful prose in both documents. (See below for peer response assignments.)

To complete the work you will need to have Dan Reisel's "10 Mistakes List" (<http://www.broca.org/style.html>) open in another window.

There are 2 goals for the peer response: tighten the writing and ensure that the content is the most effective for showing that the object is talkative.

When completing your response, using a different color font or Word Commenting.

### **File Download and Submission Instructions**

These instructions must be followed exactly. This includes the hyphens. File naming is important for a variety of reasons, as are following submission instructions. If you submit writing to a journal or magazine and don't follow their instructions, it will not be read. It is vital to get in practice of doing this.

To access the file you will be working on, go to the "harpers-annotation-rd" folder in Dropbox and download it to your computer. Then save the file as:

**core2s13-harpers-rd-authorlastname-yourinitials.doc** or .docx,

For example, if BW was responding to Tonis's document, the file name would be:

**core2s13-harpers-rd-dibona-bw.doc** or .docx

In the "harpers-annotation-rd" folder there is a folder called "harpers-responded-to." Upload the draft of the paper you have responded to that folder. Use the naming convention discussed in the above paragraph.

### **Peer Response Instructions**

1. Read Dan Reisel's "10 Mistakes List" thoroughly. Read the annotation thoroughly.
2. Using Dan Reisel's "10 Mistakes List," go through the annotations list item by item and add comments and make in-line corrections/changes. **Be brutal.** This exercise will be pointless unless you are brutal. All of our writing (mine included) suffers from most if not all of the items on Dan's list. Here is the time to catch the problems before sending out the work.

3. After reading for mistakes, go back and look at the content. As you do, consider each of the following for each of the call-outs:
  - Is the content appropriate? That is, does it show that the objects are talkative. If not, write that and make suggestions for changes.
  - Do the objects require discussion of something that is not being discussed?
  - Does the first call-out put the object(s) into a context? By this I mean, does the first call-out explain just what we are looking at. This is the most obvious call-out to be missing. The reader needs to know exactly what they are looking at and why it is/they are important for consideration.
  - Do the call-outs seem like one long narrative broken into 6 parts? If so, suggest ways to make them independent. They should be distinct entities, not a connected narrative.
  - Many of the call-outs that I have quickly seen are shorter than the required word count. In you see this, make suggestions for adding material.
  - All the other things that you can think of
  
4. Read the query letter. Consider it in terms of what you read about query letters in *Writers Market* and make appropriate suggestions. Do not just write that it is a great query letter. Doing show shows a lack of insight. Huge question: is it addressed to the correct person and department at *Harper's*?

### **Peer Response Assignments**

Cole evaluates Dibona

Dibona --> Holloway

Holloway --> Johnson

Johnson --> Marinaro

Marinaro --> Magrino

Magrino --> Maxwell

Maxwell --> Rao

Rao --> Silber

Silber --> Stainrook

Stainrook --> Teller

Teller --> Tenpenny

Tenpenny --> Thatcher

Thatcher --> Fox

Fox --> Cole

### **Due Date**

All peer responses must be completed by 9:00pm, Wednesday 4/10. It is preferred that it be completed on 4/9.