

APPENDIX 3

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|---|
| Peer Responses: Tentative Rhetorical Strategy Typology, First Written Response to a Seminar Paper | 2 |
| Category-only Version | 2 |
| Version with Examples | 4 |

Peer Responses: Tentative Rhetorical Strategy Typology, First Written Response to a Seminar Paper

Writer = Student author of the paper being responded to.

Responder = Student peer responder.

| | Responder's Strategies | Responder's actions on Blackboard . . . |
|--|---|--|
| DNM: Does not make knowledge collaboratively in response to the paper | Does not respond to others' postings | No responses. |
| | Does not engage with posting when responding | Silences the text. After a very brief acknowledgement of the posting (or none at all), responder writes about own experiences, opinion, feelings or thoughts, without drawing direct connections to the writer's work, or to program themes or guiding questions. Responder may write about knowledge that is made from own reflections or thinking without documenting significant engagement with writer's ideas or work directly or indirectly. |
| | Responds personally/subjectively to content in the posting | Respondent describes the effect of the posting, or part of it, on his or her own emotions or personal experience. May identify specifics in the posting, but new content (in the response) is about the responder. Responds with advice or personal support for the writer, but not the writer's work. |
| STC: Steps toward collaborative knowledge-making | Identifies, documents own insights or position as affected by the paper | Attempts to articulate or revise own opinions/experiences/feelings/interpretations as formulated in "dialogue" (direct or indirect) with those of others mentioned in the posting. May draw on own subjective reactions to the posting or to material in it, as one source of new knowledge. |
| | Restates the posting writer's ideas, interpretations, conclusions | Restates writer's material, paraphrasing or in a different "language" (draws a diagram, uses metaphor, etc.) Identifies aspects of the writer's work (key points, ideas not in text, etc.) |
| | Attention paid to the social facet of collaborative knowledge-making | Acknowledges the writer's effort, emotions and/or process in writing the posting, making it public. May name or otherwise acknowledge the writer's feelings expressed in the posting. Expresses a positive evaluation of the posting, or a part of it. ("Great!" Wonderful!") May list specifics, but without analysis. ("Your comments about the author's care in description were right on." But not: "Your comments were right on, because . . .") May claim insight or learning from posting, but without elaboration on or development of writer's work. Social acknowledgement may be in the form of apologetics. ("It may be that you and I just read this section of the book differently." "I don't know – maybe I'm wrong.") |
| | Asks for more of what is begun in paper | Asks for explanation or amplification of writer's work in paper. |

| | Responder's Strategies | Responder's actions on Blackboard . . . |
|--|---|--|
| CKM: Collaborative knowledge-making (working with ideas, insights, emotions) (Several of the points here are adapted from Odell 225) | Looks for disjunctions between her or his own experiences, feelings, opinions, thoughts, and what is in the posting (disagreement/differences) | <p>Acknowledges disagreement/differences with the posting, or part of the posting. Ideally, writes about the disagreements/differences in more detail. Identifies them (limits them, makes them less than global), and tries to clarify the points of disagreement/difference.</p> <p>Responder may write about own experiences, opinions, thoughts, feelings to illustrate the disagreements/differences, or may rely on those in other material (program readings, etc.).</p> <p>(The respondent may see relationship between him or herself and the writer in a larger context, something like "we're all human," or through theoretical/value frameworks related to difference and/or power and oppression.)</p> |
| | Looks for correspondences between his or her own opinions, feelings, experiences, thoughts, and what is in the posting (agreements, samenesses) | <p>States agreement with posting, or part of posting. Ideally, as part of agreeing also identifies specific areas of consensus.</p> <p>May speculate about or explore explicit correspondences and connections between the poster's opinions, feelings, experiences, thoughts and those of the responder. Responder may write about own experiences, opinions, thoughts, feelings to illustrate correspondences, or may rely on those in other material (program readings, etc.) to make points. The emphasis in this part of the response is equally on material contributed by the writer and the responder, or tipped toward the writer.</p> <p>(The respondent may see relationship between him or herself and the writer in a larger context, something like "we're all human," or through theoretical/value frameworks related to difference and/or power and oppression.)</p> |
| | Develops (takes further) the writer's ideas, interpretations or evidence in the paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elaborates one or more points (adds own thoughts and ideas, attempts to take writer's content farther) • Applies writer's ideas to a hypothetical or actual situation. • Explores ethical/moral implications of writer's material. • Asks question/s that take the writer's work farther. (Not "explanation or amplification" but a request that the writer do more work such as "Have you thought about what Smith says in XX?".) • Synthesizes own (responder's) and writer's observations/ideas. |
| | Interprets or "makes meaning" from writer's work | <p>Moves material from the paper up or down S. I. Hayakawa's ladder of abstraction.</p> <p>Draws conclusions based in writer's work.</p> |
| | Invites continued dialogue | <p>Asks for reaction to the response or portions of it, from the posting writer or from other readers of the response.</p> <p>Asks for reply to the ideas or questions in the response.</p> |

**PEER RESPONSES: TENTATIVE RHETORICAL STRATEGY TYPOLOGY, FIRST WRITTEN RESPONSE TO A SEMINAR PAPER
(VERSION WITH EXAMPLES)**

Writer = Student author of the paper being responded to.

Responder = Student peer responder.

| | Responder's Strategies | Responder's actions on Blackboard . . . |
|--|--|---|
| DNM: Does not make knowledge collaboratively in response to the paper | Does not respond to others' postings | No responses. |
| | Does not engage with posting when responding | <p>Silences the text. After a very brief acknowledgement of the posting (or none at all), responder writes about own experiences, opinion, feelings or thoughts, without drawing direct connections to the writer's work, or to program themes or guiding questions. Responder may write about knowledge that is made from own reflections or thinking without documenting significant engagement with writer's ideas or work directly or indirectly.</p> <p><i>I enjoyed your candidness concerning your reaction to the "normalcy" of life at OSC. The back cover of Train go Sorry states that in American Sign Language this means, "missing the boat." I know that in last Tuesday's class I was pretty vocal about not sending my child to a school for the Deaf were I faced with this issue. Perhaps this is in part because I am a mother whose daughter is the world to her; outside from my husband and sister-in-law she is the only immediate family I have to surround myself with. And the thought of not seeing her everyday is incomprehensible. As I read Train go Sorry I gain the inkling that to deny a deaf child such cultural richness would indeed be to "miss the boat." (R#17)</i></p> <p><i>I am developing a growing sympathy for the deaf trying to learn and function in hearing world. (R#18)</i></p> |
| | Responds personally/subjectively to content in the posting | <p>Respondent describes the effect of the posting, or part of it, on his or her own emotions or personal experience. May identify specifics in the posting, but new content (in the response) is about the responder.</p> <p><i>I enjoyed reading your paper . . . it showed me how I could have made my own paper stronger. (R#1)</i></p> <p>Responds with advice or personal support for the writer, but not the writer's work.</p> |

| | Responder's Strategies | Responder's actions on Blackboard . . . |
|---|---|--|
| STC: Steps toward collaborative knowledge-making | Identifies, documents own insights or position as affected by the paper | <p>Attempts to articulate or revise own opinions/experiences/feelings/interpretations as formulated in “dialogue” (direct or indirect) with those of others mentioned in the posting.</p> <p><i>But after reading your critique, it opened my eyes a little more. . . . After reading your piece, and thinking about the book, I now understand what that [restricted female active participation in sport] was like for Doris Goodwin and the other females . . .</i> (R#11)</p> <p>May draw on own subjective reactions to the posting or to material in it, as one source of new knowledge.</p> |
| | Restates the posting writer's ideas, interpretations, conclusions | <p>Restates writer's material, paraphrasing or in a different “language” (draws a diagram, uses metaphor, etc.)</p> <p><i>I also agree that Phil taught his players, who thought because of [sic] they had made the NBA and had nothing more to learn about basketball, that indeed they had more to learn about being brave and compassion towards themselves, their teammates and their opponents.</i> (R#2)</p> <p>Identifies aspects of the writer's work (key points, ideas not in text, etc.)</p> <p><i>You summarized the main point of the book well - selflessness and teamwork.</i> (R#9)</p> <p><i>It was great to see that you made a connection between what Phil Jackson was trying to communicate in his book and what is going on with the Seattle Super Sonics advertisement campaign this year built around teamwork.</i> (R#3)</p> |
| | Attention paid to the social facet of collaborative knowledge-making | <p>Acknowledges the writer's effort, emotions and/or process in writing the posting, making it public. May name or otherwise acknowledge the writer's feelings expressed in the posting.</p> <p>Expresses a positive evaluation of the posting, or a part of it. (“Great!” Wonderful!”) May list specifics, but without analysis. (“Your comments about the author's care in description were right on.” But not: “Your comments were right on, because . . .”) May claim insight or learning from posting, but without elaboration on or development of writer's work.</p> <p><i>Wow . . . What a moving and beautiful piece. I envy your ability with words and the essence you have captured of witnessing. Perhaps a publication piece one day?</i> (R#17)</p> <p>Social acknowledgement may be in the form of apologetics. (“It may be that you and I just read this section of the book differently.” “I don't know – maybe I'm wrong.”)</p> |
| | Asks for more of what is begun in paper | <p>Asks for explanation or amplification of writer's work in paper.</p> <p><i>The most interesting part was the paragraph on the ways in which Goodwin's knowledge of baseball enabled her to enter into conversations between older men and/or boys. You could have expanded on this point so that it became the focus of your writing.</i> (R#10)</p> |

| | Responder's Strategies | Responder's actions on Blackboard . . . |
|--|---|--|
| CKM: Collaborative knowledge-making (working with ideas, insights, emotions) (Several of the points here are adapted from Odell 225) | Looks for disjunctions between her or his own experiences, feelings, opinions, thoughts, and what is in the posting (disagreement/differences) | <p>Acknowledges disagreement/differences with the posting, or part of the posting. Ideally, writes about the disagreements/differences in more detail. Identifies them (limits them, makes them less than global), and tries to clarify the points of disagreement/difference.</p> <p><i>I disagree about your assessment of her denial of racism . . .</i> (R#1)</p> <p>Responder may write about own experiences, opinions, thoughts, feelings to illustrate the disagreements/differences, or may rely on those in other material (program readings, etc.).</p> <p><i>I disagree about your assessment of her denial of racism . . . I think Goodwin provided ample evidence of her realization of how life was for minorities. (followed by quotes from book)</i> (R#1)</p> <p>(The respondent may see relationship between him or herself and the writer in a larger context, something like "we're all human," or through theoretical/value frameworks related to difference and/or power and oppression.)</p> |
| | Looks for correspondences between his or her own opinions, feelings, experiences, thoughts, and what is in the posting (agreements, samenesses) | <p>States agreement with posting, or part of posting. Ideally, as part of agreeing also identifies specific areas of consensus.</p> <p><i>I, too, was upset about the treatment of Mrs. Cohen at the hospital.</i> (R#18)</p> <p><i>This indeed read as a management self-help book, with an attempt to dazzle us with the names of Jordan and Pippen.</i> (R#12)</p> <p>May speculate about or explore explicit correspondences and connections between the poster's opinions, feelings, experiences, thoughts and those of the responder. Responder may write about own experiences, opinions, thoughts, feelings to illustrate correspondences, or may rely on those in other material (program readings, etc.) to make points. The emphasis in this part of the response is equally on material contributed by the writer and the responder, or tipped toward the writer.</p> <p>(The respondent may see relationship between him or herself and the writer in a larger context, something like "we're all human," or through theoretical/value frameworks related to difference and/or power and oppression.)</p> |

| | Responder's Strategies | Responder's actions on Blackboard . . . |
|--|---|--|
| | Develops (takes further) the writer's ideas, interpretations or evidence in the paper | <p>Elaborates one or more points (adds own thoughts and ideas, attempts to take writer's content farther) <i>I wonder what it would have been like if he didn't have the "superstars" on the team to begin with?" (R#2)</i></p> <p>Applies writer's ideas to a hypothetical or actual situation. <i>This was a particularly pleasing aspect of Doris' childhood, and it was refreshing to see this pointed out by [you] . . . Attending [a community college's] games, I find that more of the "town folk" overcoming some of the social pressures "that would otherwise impede people truly learning about each other and help overcome their misperceptions, stereotypes, and biases towards each other" as more members of the community attend. . . (R#4)</i></p> <p>Explores ethical/moral implications of writer's material.</p> <p>Asks question/s that take the writer's work farther. (Not "explanation or amplification" but a request that the writer do more work such as "Have you thought about what Smith says in XX?".)</p> <p>Synthesizes own (responder's) and writer's observations/ideas.</p> |
| | Interprets or "makes meaning" from writer's work | <p>Moves material from the paper up or down S. I. Hayakawa's ladder of abstraction. <i>I appreciated you[r] comparison of normalcy with your childhood weight issue. Being "normal" is an issue that we will be grappling with, both individually and as a class. We all want to be part of a community, be it the peer groups of grade school or, as an adult, the culture in which we live. (R#18)</i></p> <p><i>[Your] critique to this book helped shed a new perspective on how something universal could be brought to better all of humanity in a simple matter. (R#4)</i></p> <p>Draws conclusions based in writer's work. <i>[Paper writer] points out something that I did not see while reading this book which was [that] Jackson's use of "spiritual exploration" was a way to deal with the isolation of being a professional athlete and especially what people would refer to as "superstars". Jackson's approach was successful in getting all of the egos to work together for a common goal . . . his approach would lead to success although the media would want to continue to isolate players from one another by focusing on Jordan, Pippen and Rodman. (R#2)]</i></p> |
| | Invites continued dialogue | <p>Asks for reaction to the response or portions of it, from the posting writer or from other readers of the response.</p> <p>Asks for reply to the ideas or questions in the response.</p> |