

### Peer Feedback ...

- ... is the mutual text feedback between writers in a similar working situation (e.g. students, doctoral candidates),
- ... is given on the basis of a text sample of manageable size,
- ... contains feedback on the impact of the text on a (non-specialist) reader, no assessment as to whether its content is technically correct or relevant,
- ... helps writers to reflect themselves better on their writing and to discover "blind spots",
- ... considers the current writing phase of text processing (raw version or revised version) and
- ... is useful in each phase of the writing process.

### Peer Feedback is based on the following rules:

- ✓ **Motivating** and **positive**, with a friendly reading attitude, no destructive criticism.
- ✓ **Descriptive** rather than judgmental or corrective, **subjective** instead of universally valid.
- ✓ Referring to **concrete** text passages and naming concrete reading impressions.
- ✓ Focused on a **specific** aspect of the text (e.g. main story line, comprehensibility, linguistic-stylistic level) and oriented towards the desired feedback.
- ✓ **Pragmatically** oriented towards the feasibility/practicability for the writer.

### Possible levels of text feedback:

Text levels	Possible questions about the text
coarse structural	Is the structure of the text comprehensible? Is the argumentation comprehensible? Do individual sections build on each other? Does the research question become clear?
fine structural	Does each individual section have one clear message? Is the key message of each section clear? Are the sentences sufficiently connected?
linguistic	Are the sentences clearly formulated? Is the language "scientific"? Are technical terms used appropriately?
stylistic	Is the text reader friendly? Do the sentences have an appropriate length? Does the reader orientation work?
formal	Are grammar, spelling, punctuation and layout correct? Are quotation conventions observed?

### What is important when preparing and giving peer-feedback?

- Ask the author what kind of feedback they would want and keep it in mind during your work with the text.
- Focus your attention primarily at the text level in question (rough or fine structure, language & style, formal criteria).
- Follow your first reading impression: Which passages are fluent and easy to understand? Where do you stumble over parts of the text? Where do contents remain unclear? Where do questions arise? Mark passages and note, e.g.:
  - (!!) I understood this passage perfectly.
  - (!) I think I got this passage.
  - (?) I'm not sure I understood that passage right.
  - (??) I didn't understand that passage.
- Name positive things first: What did you like about the text as a whole? Where do you think its strongest points are?
- Summarize the contents of the text read in one sentence: What is the main message of the text?
- Which suggestions for revisions would you like to give to the author of the text (in terms of content, structure, language)?

### What is important when receiving and dealing with peer feedback on your own texts?

- Listen carefully and try to understand what the feedback provider means. Ask if you have not quite understood.
- Avoid explanations, do not justify yourself and your text.
- Say thanks to the peer for giving the feedback.
- Decide which hints and suggestions you want to take up and which ones not.
- Revise your text as soon as possible after receiving peer feedback.
- If possible, always concentrate on one aspect/one text level.
- Use feedback as an opportunity for self-reflection and further development of your writing skills: Which fundamental opportunities for improvement potentials become clear beyond the concrete text example?