

## Instructions for peer assessment

Analysis of Works 1, Academic written assignment, Friday 22nd of november 2013

### Procedure:

- 1) Pair up (in feedback groups). The teacher will assign two papers from the other group for you to evaluate.
- 2) Read the instructions and then the two papers. Confer with the instruction manual and make notes about if and why you find the papers to be okay or satisfactory in the stated criteria.
- 3) Go through the papers together with your partner, write your comments in the documents (and save as a new document), and give your reasons for whether you find the papers to be okay or satisfactory in the stated criteria.
- 4) Give the paper points according to the following guidelines:
  - a. 3 points: if you deem the paper to be satisfactory in all criteria.
  - b. 2 points: if you deem that all criteria are okay and at least two are satisfactory.
  - c. 1 point: if you deem that at least four criteria are okay.
  - d. 0 points: in all other cases.

### Criteria for assessment

#### 1) Formalities and language

The paper is **okay**, if:

- It makes use of proper referencing. That is:
  - A reference is made for citations and every time a new notion or technical term (e.g. focalization) is introduced or when arguing with reference to another author.
  - A choice has been made between the footnote system and the author-year system and this is used consistently (see Guidelines for Academic Writing, 2013) and the paper has a complete reference list.
  - All references include author, title (correctly italicized), publisher (possibly also place) and year.
- The presentation has a clear layout and has been proofread, so there are no syntactic errors or other crude mistakes.

The paper is **satisfactory** if:

- It has been thoroughly proofread (max. 3 mistakes per page), including placing of commas and other punctuation in the smallest details such as full stops at the end of footnotes.
- The language is clear and easily read.
- Year, nationality and title is stated every time an author/historical person is introduced for the first time in the text.

## 2) Structure and argumentation

The paper is **okay**, if:

- It has a clear and easily understood structure, which is supported by accurate headings.

The paper is **satisfactory**, if:

- It has a strict and logical structure where it is at all times clear when a section is a relevant and necessary part of the investigation/argument.

## 3) Conceptual precision and historical accuracy

The paper is **okay**, if:

- It defines the used academic concepts (with correct references) and clear up any possible ambiguities (disputed or controversial notions and the like).

The paper is **satisfactory**, if:

- It specifies the historical context (time, space, possibly origin) in cases where reference is made to historical phenomena in connection with the work (e.g. other works or historical persons and events).
- It accounts for analytical/theoretical choices that are not obvious (e.g. if they haven't been mentioned in the thesis statement or in the exam question).

## 4) Analytical thoroughness

- The paper is **okay**, if:

- It accounts for significant connections or antitheses between the story and the language of the drama.
- It goes into at least one of the character's perspectives in depth and describes the focalization in relation to this character.
- It accounts for dramaturgical grips or conventions through which the playwright reveals his position of narration in the work.

The paper is **satisfactory** if:

- The answering of the questions are done with references that are close to the text of the work.
- If the answers to the questions work towards a complete characteristic of the work's aesthetic enunciation.

## 5) Independence

The paper is **okay**, if:

- It shows that it is able to make use of other analytical tools than those the assignment demands when these are relevant for the investigation (e.g. observations of characters, structure and genre).

The paper is **satisfactory**, if:

- It is able of accounting for the relevance and the precision of its observations, e.g. by referring to other works, in a production perspective, in relation to specific theatre conventions or traditions (e.g. epic theater, naturalism etc.) or in connection with certain societal issues.