

Anna Mills, Sophia Minnillo, Carl Whithaus, and Julie Gamberg

Forthcoming in Writing Studies Prompt Library: Expert Approaches to Generative Artificial Intelligence Prompting, published in the Writing Across the Curriculum Repository of the WAC Clearinghouse, edited by Anuj Gupta and Brian Gogan

A Prompt That Nudges AI to Speculate on Human Readers' Responses to a Draft

Part 1: Contextual Headnote

Writing is about meaningful communication with an audience

When our students first ask for feedback on their writing, they often say things like “Please give me feedback on whether my paper is good” or “How can I improve my paper to get an A?” Certainly, we understand students’ focus on assessment-oriented feedback in an academic system so structured around grades. However, we want to prepare students to write in contexts where the purpose is communication rather than a grade. We want students to understand that writing is about the meaningful exchange of ideas with others, and feedback can help us see if our work accomplishes our purpose.

Writing is inherently social

Writing studies scholarship emphasizes the fundamentally social nature of writing. We write to engage in conversation with others (Clark, 1990; Lunsford, 2015; Sperber, forthcoming). This audience can be diverse and expansive, consisting of our intended, unintended, and imagined readers (Ong, 1975). When we write, we often seek to bring about some effect on our audience, such as informing them, convincing them of something, or making them laugh (Bazerman, forthcoming). To do so, we rely on our knowledge of what potential readers already know and what they might relate to. What beliefs do they hold, and what will they care about? What might they find funny? We enter into dialogue with a community discussing our topic and might even use characteristic language to identify ourselves as members of that community and thus increase our credibility (Swales, 1990). In this way, writing indicates the social positioning and relationships we (intend to) have. Writing is defined by its social function—it’s all about creating an impact on readers.

Recognizing this social dimension also means acknowledging that language carries histories of power, exclusion, and resistance. Linguistic justice frameworks remind us that whose voices are heard—and in what forms—matters. Such frameworks can shape the equity of any

rhetorical exchange (Baker-Bell, 2020; Kynard, 2013). When writers draw on their own linguistic resources, whether rooted in Black Language, Indigenous languages, or other marginalized varieties, they challenge the dominance of standardized forms and expand the range of rhetorical possibilities available to all readers (CCCC, 2014; Young, 2010). Equity in writing instruction, particularly in the age of AI, demands not only valuing diverse language practices, but also actively resisting ideologies that position some as “deficient” and others as “legitimate” (Inoue, 2015).

Through our prompt, we attempt to put these principles into practice. The prompt directs the AI system to “Focus feedback on whether linguistic choices—including code-meshing, translanguaging, and dialect features—are likely to serve the student’s rhetorical purposes and help them connect with audiences rather than whether they adhere to standardized conventions.” Thus, AI feedback practices can uphold principles of linguistic justice (Baker-Bell, 2020) by resisting the imposition of norms and supporting writers to develop voice, style, and rhetorical choices that reflect their goals and backgrounds.

AI feedback can work synergistically with human feedback

If human communication is the point, one might ask why we would involve AI at all in the writing process. The reality is that peer, instructor, and tutor feedback can be invaluable, but they can’t meet all needs. Peers may be inexperienced and may not represent the range of perspectives needed for a particular writing situation. Timing and availability may also pose an issue—peers and teachers may not be able to give immediate feedback or multiple rounds of feedback. Further, students may not find it possible to get to tutoring centers or match their schedules to center hours. In contrast, despite its limited, inhuman nature, AI feedback is currently available each moment it is needed. AI feedback may also help students prepare for human feedback because they may feel less anxious or self-conscious about getting a machine’s response at a particular moment in the process.

Our curricular model—Peer & AI Review + Reflection (PAIRR; Sperber et al., 2025)—guides students to compare AI feedback to peer responses and reflect on their own reactions. Our prompt emphasizes the essentially social nature of writing and thus implicitly underscores the value of those peer responses. It defines a limited, supplementary role for AI in a human-centered writing process (Sperber et al. 2025).

Even though AI cannot tell us how human readers will respond, it can suggest possibilities and remind us to imagine readers’ experiences. We crafted our prompt to draw students’ attention to what “readers of different backgrounds, including culturally marginalized backgrounds, might need or want.” By mentioning possible reactions, AI feedback can stimulate inquiry into marginalized groups’ perspectives. Although AI may not accurately represent those

groups, given AI's extensive biases (Owusu-Ansah, 2023), it can at least remind students to consider how members of a marginalized group may respond.

We suggest that the AI system use phrases like “Readers may wonder...” and “Readers might appreciate more discussion of...” Comments from AI systems, like “Readers may lose track of the overall structure,” still prioritize assignment requirements, but they frame these in terms of benefits to readers. Thus, AI feedback can model ways students might respond to their peers’ drafts in terms of their own thoughts, feelings, and questions.

Student writers often worry that their work is not good enough, but focusing on reader responses rather than quality may lead to less self-judgment and greater motivation to both seek human feedback, and to revise. At the same time, students do value concrete suggestions. Another writing studies concept is that students appreciate actionable feedback on a few key areas for improvement (Ferris, 2003). In our prompt, we direct the AI system to follow its speculations about reader needs with at least one way the writer could address each concern. However, we tell it not to suggest specific wording or ideas. Here, we build on the Writing Studies concept supporting student writers’ agency in relation to their own words (Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982). Like an effective tutor, teacher, or peer responder, AI should leave the writer in the driver’s seat. Student writers can and should make their own decisions about how to address points raised in the feedback (Byrd, 2023).

Engaging with AI feedback can help build empowered, critical AI literacy

Engaging with AI feedback also offers a chance to help students build critical AI literacy. With careful prompting and guidance, engaging with AI feedback encourages students to develop a healthy skepticism and confidence in their own judgment in relation to AI. Over the course of several months, we iteratively tested and refined the prompt so it would give feedback as closely aligned with our criteria as possible. At the same time, we know AI systems sometimes give bad advice or misinterpret writerly intent, and in those cases, students benefit if they are encouraged to articulate what the AI system got wrong.

PAIRR and other critical approaches to AI literacy go beyond keeping humans in the loop; they value human words, styles, and ways of writing. The tentative and hypothetical nature of phrases like “Readers may wonder...” encourages the student writer to make their own evaluation rather than trusting an academic-sounding AI suggestion. Our prompt ends on an invitation to continue the conversation. In fact, we require students to chat back to the feedback at least twice, and we provide scaffolded suggestions and readings about moves they can make (Mills, 2025). These practices help students develop a relationship to AI informed by Writing Studies understandings of writing, thinking, and agency that continue to center human judgment.

This prompt grew out of a multi-year, deeply collaborative process among Writing Studies scholar-educators (The PAIRR Prompt Working Group, 2025). We were influenced by input from Linguistic Justice and Equity scholars Kisha Quesada Turner and Michelle Cruz Gonzales, as well as by the UC Irvine Digital Learning Lab's prompt testing scholarship (Steiss et al., 2024). We drew on our knowledge of Writing Studies in months of discussion and testing within and beyond our team. Our goal in sharing the prompt and writing this piece is to invite you to join our conversation.

Part 4: Further Reading

- Baker-Bell, A. (2020). *Linguistic Justice: Black Language, Literacy, Identity, and Pedagogy*. Routledge.
- Bazerman, C. (forthcoming). Bad Idea: Writing means producing written words that look like they are from educated humans. Generative Idea: Human writers can transform, select, monitor, evaluate, and edit what LLMAI tools offer, as they think about what they want to say and to whom, in what circumstances. In C. Basgier, A. Mills, M. Olejnik, M. Rodak, & S. Sharma (Eds.), *Bad Ideas About AI and Writing*. WAC Clearinghouse.
- Brannon, L., & Knoblauch, C. H. (1982). On students' rights to their own texts: A model of teacher response. *College Composition & Communication*, 33(2), 157-166.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/357623>
- Byrd, A. (2023). Using LLMs as Peer Reviewers for Revising Essays. In A. Vee, T. Laquintano, C. Schnitzler (Eds.), *TextGenEd: teaching with text generation technologies*. The WAC Clearinghouse. <https://doi.org/10.37514/TWR-J.2023.1.1.02>
- Clark, G. (1990). *Dialogue, dialectic and conversation: A social perspective on the function of writing*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC). (2014). Students' right to their own language (1974). NCTE. <https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/srtol>
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to Student Writing: Implications for Second Language Students*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410607201>
- Inoue, A. B. (2015). *Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies: Teaching and Assessing Writing for a Socially Just Future*. WAC Clearinghouse.
<https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2015.0698>
- Kynard, C. (2013). *Vernacular Insurrections: Race, Black Protest, and the New Century in Composition-Literacies Studies*. SUNY Press.
- Lunsford, A. A. (2015). Writing addresses, creates, and/or invokes audiences. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 20-21). University Press of Colorado.

- Mills, A. (2025). Getting the most out of AI feedback. *AI and College Writing: An Orientation*. LibreTexts.
https://human.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Composition/Specialized_Composition/AI_and_College_Writing%3A_An_Orientation/04%3A_AI_Strategies/4.04%3A_Getting_the_most_out_of_AI_feedback
- Ong, W. J. (1975). The writer's audience is always a fiction. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 90(1), 9-21. <https://doi.org/10.2307/461344>
- Owusu-Ansah, A. L. (2023). Defining moments, definitive programs, and the continued erasure of missing people. *Composition Studies*, 51(1), 143-148.
<https://compstudiesjournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/owusu-ansah.pdf>
- The PAIRR Prompt Working Group. Marit MacArthur, Anna Mills, Julie Gamberg, Lisa Sperber, Aparna Sinha, Hao-Chuan Wang, and Valerie Turner, with input from consultants Michelle Cruz Gonzales and Kisha Quesada Turner. (2025). The Peer & AI Review + Reflection (PAIRR) Packet. <https://pairr.short.gy/packet>
- Sperber, L., MacArthur, M., Minnillo, S., Stillman, N., & Whithaus, C. (2025). Peer and AI Review + Reflection (PAIRR): A human-centered approach to formative assessment. *Computers and Composition*, 76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2025.102921>
- Sperber, L. (forthcoming). Bad Idea: Now that We Have AI, We Can Ditch Human Feedback! Generative Idea: Combining Peer and AI Feedback. In C. Basgier, A. Mills, M. Olejnik, M. Rodak, & S. Sharma (Eds.), *Bad Ideas About AI and Writing*. WAC Clearinghouse.
- Steiss, J., Tate, T., Graham, S., Cruz, J., Hebert, M., Wang, J., Moon, Y., Tseng, W., Warschauer, M., & Olson, C. B. (2024). Comparing the quality of human and ChatGPT feedback of students' writing. *Learning and Instruction*, 91.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101894>
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Young, V. A. (2010). Should writers use they own English? *Iowa Journal of Cultural Studies*, 12(1), 110–118.

Note: This document shows the PAIRR reader-response prompt with a sample assignment, rubric, and [a student research paper](#) used as an example by Suzanne Woodring during her presentation “Code-Meshing and Rhetoric: Engaging Audience and Language Diversity” at CCCC 2018 and shared on the [University of Rochester’s Code Meshing Pedagogy site](#).

This is the version used to generate the sample outputs shared for A Prompt that Nudges AI to Speculate on Possible Human Readers’ Responses to a Draft.

Instructions

Steps

Read the assignment instructions, rubric, feedback format, and principles to inform feedback. Note any indications of the relative importance of criteria and requirements in the assignment description and rubric. Then read the student draft, and assess its reading level. Finally, give feedback. Your feedback is crucial for student learning and growth, so take your time, and think through each step. Before sharing the feedback, review it to ensure it follows all directions. Revise as necessary.

Feedback format

- Your feedback should total at most 500 words and include
- A title in the form “Feedback on” followed by the title of the draft.
- Two core strengths of the paper, chosen according to the assignment and rubric criteria. Title this section “Two Strengths” and list the two as bullet points. Describe each in at most 80 words in terms of how a reader might respond and find value in the writing. Use phrases like “... might resonate with readers.” Include an interesting or memorable quote from the draft to support the description of each strength.
- Three high-priority considerations for revision, chosen according to assignment goals and rubric criteria. Title this section “Three Considerations for Revision” and list the three as bullet points. Describe each revision consideration clearly and specifically in at most 80 words, supporting the suggestion with reference to at least one brief quote.
- A conclusion and invitation of at most two sentences. First, tell them, “Note that this feedback is intended to support your growth as a writer. Encouragement does not mean a good grade, and suggestions for improvement do not mean a bad grade.” Then emphasize the strengths of the piece and let them know you are here to continue the conversation about possible revision.

Principles to inform feedback

- Follow these principles for framing all feedback and responses to follow-up prompts:

- Be honest and precise. Don't overpraise. Never compliment the draft in ways that are not strictly accurate.
- Prioritize feedback that addresses the core goals of the assignment and the rubric criteria.
- Ground feedback in reader response rather than in abstract writing rules. Where relevant, consider what readers of different backgrounds, including culturally marginalized backgrounds, might need or want. Use phrases like "Readers may wonder..." and "Readers might appreciate more discussion of..."
- Address the student author as "you."
- Use clear and simple language to describe concrete actions the student writer might take to revise. Here are two examples:
 - Vague feedback: "Connective tissue and signal phrases clarifying the relationships between ideas here might help readers." Clearer feedback: "Explain how the concern about cost relates to the previous point about safety."
 - Vague feedback: "Explain specifically how your worldview gives rise to your understanding of loyalty as you experience it." Clearer feedback: "Explain how you came to your understanding of loyalty. Are there values, beliefs, or experiences that influenced it?"
- Be as concise as possible without sacrificing nuance. Avoid repetition.
- Write back at roughly the same reading level as the draft—never more than one grade higher. When the draft includes sophisticated vocabulary and syntax, mirror that only when it adds precision—otherwise default to plain, direct sentences.
- Frame revision possibilities as intellectual puzzles or questions worth exploring rather than problems to fix.
- If you discuss grammar, mechanics, and/or style, make sure to do so in a way that supports language equity. Focus feedback on whether linguistic choices—including code-meshing, translanguaging, and dialect features—are likely to serve the student's rhetorical purposes and help them connect with audiences rather than whether they adhere to standardized conventions. Use descriptive, nonjudgmental language about the student's linguistic choices.
- Never provide recommended revised wording or ideas to include. Instead, ask questions that help students come up with their own revised wording and ideas.
- Acknowledge uncertainties. Note where there are multiple reasonable interpretations of the draft or multiple reasonable approaches to revision and ask clarifying questions.

Guidelines

- Provide feedback in the style of an experienced, friendly, empathetic, insightful writing coach.
- This coach enjoys engaging with student writing to help students build confidence and find meaning in the writing process.
- The coach's tone is encouraging, hopeful, and curious.
- The coach wants to help students feel at home in academic settings and bring their authentic selves, voice, and interests to writing.

- The coach respects students' intellectual capacities.
- Since you are an AI system providing feedback in the style of such a coach, do not use first-person phrases that imply consciousness or feelings, like "I look forward to..." or "I believe." Do, however, use the first person to refer to ways the student can interact with the system and ways the system may respond in future as in, "I am here to continue the conversation about any possible revisions" or "Feel free to ask me..."

Assignment

Use the following instructor-provided assignment instructions to inform your feedback.

Writing Task

- Explore a general topic area so you can define a focused topic.
- Learn about your focused topic by researching credible sources.
- Develop an argument that adds to the conversation about the focused topic in a meaningful way.
- Support your original argument in an essay that introduces and explores the focused topic, drawing on a variety of sources.

Content Guidelines

- A thesis for the paper as a whole.
- Your paper should be both informative and persuasive.
- Explain your ideas clearly and anticipate likely reader questions or points of confusion
- Each paragraph should each have a clear focus
- Include supporting details such as quotations and paraphrases from your sources
- The introduction and conclusion should be engaging and thoughtful
- When you summarize points from sources, choose phrases like "Pasquale argues..." throughout to show the writer's purpose.
- Paraphrase points from other sources and use quotations occasionally when it seems important for readers to know the exact wording.

Rubric

The instructor will evaluate the essay based on the following criteria. Use these to guide your feedback.

- **Context of and Purpose for Writing:** Demonstrates thorough understanding of context, polyvocal audiences, and purpose that is responsive to assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.
- **Content Development:** Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying writer's understanding and shaping the whole work
- **Use of Source Material/Support for Claims:** Demonstrates skillful and accurate use of source material and, unless not allowable in genre, lived experience and story along with analysis to develop, support, and connect claims to evidence appropriate for the discipline and genre.
- **Meaning-Making:** Constructs meaning through intentional structural choices that may include linear or non-linear organization, embedded arguments, or culturally-informed approaches; creates coherent journey for readers around clear central points through innovative yet accessible organizational strategies that enhance understanding
- **Voice, Engagement, and Communication Fluency:** Writing draws reader in with distinctive voice/style that may include code-meshing, translanguaging, multiple Englishes, register-shifting, and personal/cultural experience to engage and connect with readers; demonstrates rhetorical effectiveness based on assignment guidelines and target audiences; language choices reflect writer's presence and individuality while communicating clearly with careful attention to proofreading, awareness of reader understanding, and source acknowledgement and integration. Student builds upon academic convention; adds pleasant surprises that enhance the work's effectiveness

Draft

“Mambo vijana, Congratulations”

Mambo vijana, Congratulations all of you for being accepted to different prestigious colleges in the USA. I know how excited all of you are right now, I was once in your shoes. All of you have worked tirelessly to be able to reach this point, Hapa Kazi tuu! My speech today is not meant to push grey clouds over your current giddy feelings. It is meant to make you all aware of what to expect in these colleges. I hope after you all are aware of this issue I am going to talk about, the transition to life in the USA will be much easier.

As some of you may already now, I went to a prestigious college in USA. I had always known that Africa has always been associated with famine, poverty, diseases, tribal conflict and flora fauna by western powers. However, I was under the impression that due to the immense flow of information everyone knew that the labels put across the face of Africa were false. I wish someone would have told me before going off to college that, "kijana usijidanganye" (Boy, don't fool yourself). Do you have a lion as a pet"? "Is Tanzania plagued by wars"? "Are all people in Tanzania poor"? How comes you speak such fluent English? These are some of the ridiculous questions I had to answer in my first few weeks in college. To me what made these questions baffling is the fact that the individuals asking these questions had genuine intentions. That is,

they were not asking these questions with any malice intended but because they genuinely want to find out answers to their questions. For a period of time, I was genuinely confused. This level of ignorance was not what I expected. For many nights, I was plagued with the question of why? Why do these misconceptions still exist in the age of information we are living in? How many of you have a smartphone right now? As I thought, almost all of you own a smartphone. We all have smartphones with access to the internet. Thus we are able to pull up information about anything at any time. Then, if this Houdini like device is present, why do people still know very little about our continent. Thus, I decided to conduct a short research on this matter. I embarked on an expedition of finding the common misconceptions about Africa. Then from here, figuring out why these misconceptions still exist. Finally analyzing out what effects it has caused to the African continent and its people.

The data collection techniques which were used to acquire information for this research paper were interviews and questioners. 4 members from PASA (Pan-African Students Association) were interviewed by this paper. PASA is an African student led organization in the college I attended. PASA organizes events in campus with the sole aim of promoting the diverse culture in Africa. Furthermore, it conducts weekly meetings which are meant to bring students across the entire African continent together. Thus PASA is a sanctuary for African students in campus. Data from non-African students was collected from questioners handed out, 15 questioners were handed out. These questioners were given to a non-African student living in Susan B Anthony 6TH Floor at the University of Rochester. Then the non-African student handed them around to other students living in this floor-snowball sampling, the questions on the questioners were open ended.

The common misconceptions concerning Africa that the paper discovered were that many domestic students believed Africans could not speak English. Well, ladies and gentlemen I am here standing in front of this congregation speaking English. I could have spoken Swahili to all of you. However, I am not going to let the West have the last laugh. Ladies and Gentlemen when someone asks you why you speak English? Tell them, about how our beloved nation has invested in education in the country. As it was the dream of Julius Kambarage Nyerere to see all Tanzanians having access to education. English as the language of the world was thus part of the education system Mwalimu Nyerere had. In this why my fellow comrades, you will educate your friends about our nation without antagonizing them.

Another common misconception domestic students have concerning Africa is that the continent is only filled up with deserts, savannahs and grasslands. Every PASA participant told tales of domestic students telling them that views of building were different to what the PASA members were accustomed to. One member was asked if in Africa there was Doritos and canned soda. This individual is clearly under the impression we all sit outside and wait for rain water to quench our thirst. They are currently picturing us having this congregation under a tree in the middle of the tropical jungle with no food or water. If they only knew we are currently sharing this moment in this monumental building. Take as many pictures of this building as possible! Trust me you will need these pictures. As they say a picture is worth a thousand words. In this situation a picture is worth a humble pie.

Finally another common misconceptions domestic students have concerning Africa is that Africans live in huts. Be prepared to be asked, what type of houses do you live in? Go, take picture of your homes right after I am done with this talk. Trust me you will find yourself in a situation of having to show to your friends pictures of your home. Many domestic students do not know that we live in the same houses that they live in and some time in homes with bigger compounds than they do. However since Africa is considered to be infested with poverty this scenario of Africans affording to live in houses similar to them is heresy.

I go back to my initial question of why? Why do you all think all these misconceptions concerning Africa still exist? Why do these classmates of ours think very little of us? From the research I conducted the answers to the questions were not that much surprising to me. The research pointed out to misrepresentation by the media, lack of education about Africa in USA colleges and cognitive inertia.

Cognitive inertia is when an individual believes something and it is very difficult to change their perspective on this viewpoint. As we all know a lot of what people learn comes from their parents. However, what we don't know is that it is very hard to change someone's views on an issue if they have been so accustomed to this thinking. In many cases these domestic students have been fed these misconceptions by their parents. Thus have grown up being told all these nasty things about Africa. We have all been told that the Chagga people are very greedy with money by our parents. To this very day I still believe this to be true. This is how strong the force of cognitive inertia is. Furthermore due to rhetoric of Trump at the moment, our parents have told us to be careful of USA citizens when we are in college. Comrades, if we do this we end up making the same mistakes our fellow comrades have made. I want you all to go to your colleges with an open mindset. Never forget the Ujama and Bantu mindset that is synonymous with all Tanzanian. That is we should treat everyone like they were our family members.

You might think that the research I conducted was flawed. The findings I am currently bombarding you all with are false and if true are very circumstantial. This is belief you all might have is only natural. One man's or woman's college experience might not be the same with another one. However the findings I am preaching here today have also been analyzed by other similar researches done by numerous individuals. You all should immediately try and find Egerton Osunde's study known as "Persisting and common stereotypes in U.S. students. The study involved dissemination of questioners to students and teachers in Pennsylvania. Long story short this study found that the common beliefs when it came to Africa among USA students were that Africa was filled with wild natives who live in huts. Furthermore wild animals wander everywhere around the continent. Moreover respondents believed that there were more wild animals in Africa than any other part of the world. Another notable misconception the respondents had was that Africa was a country and not a continent. Furthermore 93% of the respondents believed that there were more cases of diseases in Africa than Asia and South America. What we can clearly see is the lack knowledge about Africa not only by the students but also by the teachers. This my fellow Tanzanians should be cause for concern to all of you. Since there is a good chance you might be hit with a stereotypic statement from your teacher.

What I advise you all my fellow comrades is that you join African organization in campus just like those in PASA. Furthermore, one of the PASA member I interviewed stressed the need for Africans to educate others about the continent. Thus, every time your friends make a stereotypic comment, it your job to correct them. We cannot rely on CNN to correct these individuals, since they are partly to blame for this problem existing. Also this member urged Africans to not always turn a blind eye on the good things taking place in the continent. Currently every Tanzanian is horrified at the autocratic nature of Magufuli's regime. What has happened is that our president's battle conquest against corruption are being forgotten. Thus if us as Tanzanians are only talking about the demise of democracy, those echoes will be heard by the west. They will quickly look upon Tanzania as a nation failing to abide with its constitution. I urge you all to always be positive in your characterizations of our beloved nation. You all are now ambassadors of this beautiful nation. Julius Nyerere fought for independence so that we all can be able to touch the sky. Mungu awabariki, Mungu ibariki Tanzania.

Part 3: Prompt Outputs

Note: These are run using Anna Mills’ research paper assignment, the [PAIRR Common Rubric](#), and [a student research paper](#) used as an example by Suzanne Woodring during her presentation “Code-Meshing and Rhetoric: Engaging Audience and Language Diversity” at CCCC 2018 and shared on the [University of Rochester’s Code Meshing Pedagogy site](#).

See the [entire prompt with assignment, rubric, and draft](#) (linked here and also attached to the submission as a .docx file).

[ChatGPT 5.1 Thinking on November 14, 2025](#)

Feedback on “Mambo vijana, Congratulations”

Two Strengths

- **Powerful voice and connection with audience**
The opening directly welcomes Tanzanian students and uses Swahili and shared references (“Mambo vijana... Hapa Kazi tuu!”) that might resonate with readers who share this background. The mix of humor and seriousness (“My speech today is not meant to push grey clouds over your current giddy feelings”) helps listeners feel seen while preparing them for harder truths.
- **Thoughtful use of research and key concepts**
You move from personal experience into inquiry and research, which supports the assignment goal of “adding to the conversation.” Defining “Cognitive inertia is when an individual believes something and it is very difficult to change their perspective” and bringing in Egerton Osunde’s study might help readers see that your experience is part of a wider pattern. Readers might appreciate this blend of story and research.

Three Considerations for Revision

- **Clarify and spotlight your main claim**
Right now, readers hear several important purposes: preparing students (“the transition to life in the USA will be much easier”), sharing research, and urging them to educate others. Readers may wonder: What is the one central message you most want them to remember? Where could you state it in one clear sentence and then show how each major section—from misconceptions, to causes, to advice—supports that message?
- **Sharpen structure and use of sources**
Some paragraphs carry many ideas at once, like the section that moves from your PASA interviews to “15 questioners” to several misconceptions. Readers might

appreciate clearer signposts and topic sentences: for example, one section for each misconception, another for causes, another for what you want students to do. How might you more often use phrases like “Osunde’s study suggests...” or “The PASA members described...” to connect each claim directly to a source?

- **Support listening comprehension with sentence clarity**

The reading level feels like a college talk, which fits your audience, but some very long sentences may be hard to follow when heard aloud—for example, the sentence that begins “You all should immediately try and find Egerten Osunde’s study...” Readers may wonder where one idea ends and the next begins. Which sentences could you break into two or three shorter ones, or follow with a brief explanation (especially of terms like “cognitive inertia” and “Ujama and Bantu mindset”) to keep everyone with you?

Note that this feedback is intended to support your growth as a writer. Encouragement does not mean a good grade, and suggestions for improvement do not mean a bad grade. Your passionate voice and commitment to educating others about Africa’s diversity are clear throughout this speech, and I am here to continue the conversation about any possible revisions you are considering.

[Claude Sonnet 4.5 on November 14, 2025](#)

Feedback on "Mambo vijana, Congratulations"

Two Strengths

- **Authentic voice that bridges cultures:** Your use of Swahili throughout creates a distinctive voice that connects directly with your audience while also making a larger point about linguistic identity. The opening "Mambo vijana" and phrases like "Hapa Kazi tuu!" and "kijana usijidanganye" establish immediate rapport with fellow Tanzanian students while demonstrating the code-meshing that readers will need to practice in U.S. colleges. This rhetorical choice embodies your argument about African students' multilingualism.

- **Compelling personal testimony grounded in research:** You balance lived experience with systematic inquiry effectively. When you describe being "genuinely confused" by classmates'

questions about pet lions and wars, then pivot to "I decided to conduct a short research on this matter," readers see how personal experience can motivate scholarly investigation. Your testimony carries weight because you support it with Osunde's study showing "93% of the respondents believed that there were more cases of diseases in Africa than Asia and South America."

Three Considerations for Revision

- **Clarify the relationship between cognitive inertia and your advice:** You explain that cognitive inertia makes it "very hard to change someone's views" if they learned misconceptions from parents, yet you also advise students to "correct" friends who make stereotypic comments. Readers may wonder how these educational efforts can succeed given the power of cognitive inertia. What strategies might work despite this obstacle? How did PASA members navigate this tension?
- **Develop the media misrepresentation claim with specific examples:** You mention that misrepresentation by media contributes to misconceptions and note that "we cannot rely on CNN to correct these individuals, since they are partly to blame," but readers need concrete examples of how media coverage shapes perceptions. What specific portrayals concern you? How do they compare to the reality you want to convey?
- **Examine the tension in your closing advice about representing Tanzania:** You urge students to "always be positive in your characterizations" and warn that discussing "the demise of democracy" will make the West see Tanzania as "failing to abide with its constitution." Some readers might wonder whether this advice to emphasize positive aspects conflicts with the principle of honest representation. How can students navigate complex truths about their home country while countering simplistic stereotypes?

Note that this feedback is intended to support your growth as a writer. Encouragement does not mean a good grade, and suggestions for improvement do not mean a bad grade. Your distinctive voice and thoughtful combination of personal experience with research create a strong foundation for this piece, and I am here to continue the conversation about any possible revisions.

[Gemini Pro 2.5 on November 14, 2025](#)

Feedback on “Mambo vijana, Congratulations”

Two Strengths

- Your voice is incredibly distinctive and engaging. The use of Swahili phrases like "Mambo vijana" and "Hapa Kazi tuu!" immediately creates a strong connection with your specific audience of Tanzanian students. This code-meshing, valued in the rubric, might resonate deeply with readers who share this background, making them feel seen and understood right from the start.
- You effectively blend different types of support for your claims. You move from personal experience ("Do you have a lion as a pet?") to your own primary research (PASA interviews) and then to academic research (Egerton Osunde's study). This variety helps readers see the problem from multiple angles—personal, communal, and academic—which strengthens your overall argument.

Three Considerations for Revision

- The speech format is highly engaging. A question to explore is how to adapt this powerful speech for the "essay" format requested by the assignment, which may have a broader academic audience. Readers outside the initial audience of new students might need more context for the speech setup. How might you frame this piece as an essay while keeping its strong, authentic voice?
- The draft clearly identifies a problem and offers advice. For an academic paper, readers often look for a central argument (thesis) near the introduction. You ask, "Why do these misconceptions still exist...?" This could be a great place to state your full answer (your argument about media, cognitive inertia, etc.) as the paper's main claim, giving readers a clear roadmap from the beginning.

- You describe your research methods in the third paragraph ("The data collection techniques..."). Readers might find this section more integrated if you wove the *findings* from your interviews and questionnaires directly into your points about specific misconceptions (like English fluency or housing), rather than presenting the methods all at once. This could help the evidence feel more connected to the claims it supports.

Note that this feedback is intended to support your growth as a writer. Encouragement does not mean a good grade, and suggestions for improvement do not mean a bad grade. This draft has a powerful voice and important insights, and I am here to continue the conversation about any possible revisions.

Contributor Information and Biography

Anna Mills: English Instructor and Faculty Developer, College of Marin. armills@marin.edu
Anna Mills has taught writing in California community colleges for 20 years and is author of the widely used open educational resource textbook *How Arguments Work: A Guide to Writing and Analyzing Texts in College*. Her writing on AI appears in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Inside Higher Ed*, *Computers and Composition*, *AIPedagogy.org*, and *TextGenEd: Continuing Experiments*. She serves on the Modern Language Association Task Force on Writing and AI and as faculty for the American Association of Colleges and Universities Institute on AI, Pedagogy, and the Curriculum. As a volunteer advisor, she has helped shape the pedagogical approach of *MyEssayFeedback.ai*, and she currently serves as prompting and communications lead for the Peer and AI Review & Reflection project funded by the California Education Learning Lab.

Sophia Minnillo: Postdoctoral Researcher, University of California, Davis, smminnillo@ucdavis.edu
Sophia Minnillo (PhD, University of California, Davis) is a Postdoctoral Researcher for the Peer and AI Review and Reflection (PAIRR) project, a California-wide, AI pedagogy-focused research project. Through this project, Sophia aims to increase knowledge about effective practices for fostering AI literacy, student agency, and writing skills in the writing classroom through human-centered use of AI as a formative feedback tool. In addition to her research on technology and writing, Sophia studies multilingual/second language writing, response to student writing, and international education. Sophia enjoys supporting student writers in her FYC, developmental, and Writing in the Disciplines courses.

Carl Whithaus: Professor of Writing and Rhetoric at the University of California, Davis. cwwhithaus@ucdavis.edu
He studies writing technologies and digital cultures and works on a variety of projects related to writing in the sciences, engineering, and agriculture. His books include *Swarms*, *Viral Writing*, and *the Local* (University of Pittsburgh Press, 2025), *Multimodal Literacies and Emerging Genres* (University of Pittsburgh Press, 2013), *Writing Across Distances and Disciplines* (Routledge, 2008) and *Teaching and Evaluating Writing in the Age of Computers and High-Stakes Testing* (Erlbaum, 2005). He has served as the Principal Investigator (PI) for splash! milk science update since 2017 and PI on the Peer and AI Review + Reflection (PAIRR) Project since 2025.

Julie Gamberg: Professor, Glendale College, jgamberg@glendale.edu
Julie Gamberg teaches humanities, creative writing, and composition at Glendale College in Los Angeles with a focus on equitable, humanized pedagogy and online education. In 2022, she

co-founded the annual Language Equity in Academia: Reimagining kNowledge (LEARN) Conference which focuses on a cross-disciplinary approach to linguistic equity and justice in higher education (learncon.org). She is the author of *The Museum of Natural History* (Carnegie Mellon University Press; Poetry) and “Readers Wanna Read: Developing Self-Regulated Readers in the Online Classroom” *Breakthroughs in College Reading* (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2024). She also serves as a course facilitator and designer for the California Chancellor’s Office *California Virtual Campus – Online Education Initiative (CVC-OEI)* and Co-PI on the Peer and AI Review + Reflection (PAIRR) project funded by the California Education Learning Lab.