

RESEARCH PROJECT: The Outline

Peer Review Evaluation Sheet for Draft I



Author: _____

Reviewer: _____

Below is a Yes/No rating system for each area of the paper. Designation of points in the "REVISION RATING" column is based on the degree of revision necessary; these ratings are NOT for a grade. If the author was PERFECT (i.e., no revision of any kind is necessary) in every category, they could earn 128 polish points → highly improbable.

Revision Rating Scale:		YES	NO	Line No	Revision Rating
1 = Significant Revision (Very Weak); 2 = Moderate Revision (Weak)					
3 = Minor Revision (Moderate); 4 = Revision Unnecessary (Strong)					
TITLE PAGE					
1.	Does the title page have a running head (shorter form of title) w/ page #s?				
2.	Does the title page contain a title that reflects the paper?				
CONTENT					
3.	Does the author introduce the topic area well?				
4.	Does the author provide justification for this line of investigation?				
5.	Does the author provide a thorough introduction to each topic?				
6.	Do you feel the author is well informed on the subject?				
7.	Are all the affirmative statements (e.g., "research shows") cited?				
8.	Is there a summary cohesively tying the literature with the author's thesis?				
9.	Does the author summarize the purpose?				
10.	Are the predictions (i.e., hypotheses) clear in the concluding paragraph?				
11.	Can you infer the variables (predictors) from the hypotheses?				
12.	Does the author describe the sample and population?				
13.	Does the author outline the design of the study?				
14.	Are the measures and instruments clear (i.e., replicable)?				
15.	Is the procedure clear?				
REFERENCES					
16.	Does the author have 10 peer reviewed articles cited and referenced?				
17.	Are all of the citations represented in the reference section?				
WRITING					
18.	Does the author refer to the research studies rather than authors?				
19.	Do the topics transition well from paragraph to paragraph?				
20.	Does the author use 1st or 3 rd person?				
21.	Is the bulk of the paper written in active verb voice?				
22.	Are all sentences complete (conversely not fragments)?				
23.	Did the author maintain formal empirical language (i.e., no colloquialisms, clichés or slang?)				
24.	Is the APA formatting correct for headers, citations, etc.?				
25.	Is the page formatting consistent with APA (e.g., 1"x1"x1"x1")?				
26.	Are all abbreviations first written out with a parenthesis following it to demonstrate the abbreviation? E.g., State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI)				
27.	Did the author avoid unnecessary quotations?				
28.	Spelling/grammar (i.e., semi colon, commas, spelling) polished?				
29.	Did the author avoid contractions (do not use "don't" in formal writing)?				
30.	Do citations lack first initials (they should only show up in the references)?				
31.	Do all "et al." references adhere to the "et al. Rule?" (see APA pg. 177)				
32.	Does the author avoid anthropomorphizing (e.g., "the study interpreted")?				
Total Revision Points (128):					
NOTE: Your grade is based on the effort, work and attention paid to the paper, not necessarily the degree of revision required. For that, attend to the revision points, the comments within the paper and the revisions rating					
GRADE (50 pts):					

While reading the paper, please carefully answer the following questions. If you cannot answer these questions, the writing does not provide sufficient information for a formal empirical investigation.

Read the first paragraph of the paper, then stop and respond to the following questions:

1. Are you interested in continuing to read? Why or why not?

What do you think the paper will discuss (i.e., can you identify the purpose)?
2. Does the opening paragraph clearly identify where the paper is headed, do you know the research question and the justification for the study? Is it clear how this project is different from existing studies in the area?
3. What unanswered questions remain in your mind when you have finished reading the introduction?
4. What unanswered questions remain in your mind when you have finished reading the method section?
5. What objections might be raised in critique of the research question, justification, and/or procedure?
6. What suggestions might you give to better the rough areas in the paper?
7. Based on the introduction, do you feel the author is well informed about the topic?
8. Clearly identify with examples, the specific strengths of the paper.
9. Clearly identify with examples where the writing is unclear and why.
10. How was the organization of the paper? Did the first paragraph address an introduction to the title topic? Did subsequent paragraphs elucidate this relationship?

Providing Effective Feedback: Reviewers

1. You are not reviewing the person; therefore, you should avoid using terms that imply a personal, critique.

For example, instead of using the word “you” or “your writing” or “your paper” replace with “the writing,” and “the manuscript.” You can use first person plural (e.g., We) but use this point of view sparingly.

2. Be SPECIFIC! Wherever a problem arises, provide specific feedback explaining why the writing does not flow, or how the sentence could be reworked to be effective.
3. Be SPECIFIC! Wherever the author does a good job conveying an idea or citing a reference, also acknowledge that, particularly among those papers that have a lot of challenges.
4. Be on the look out for: biased language; passive verb voice (not grammatically incorrect but it makes for convoluted writing); contractions (do not use them in empirical writing); imprecise writing; posed questions (end with a question mark) instead of rhetorical questions (these are okay, they are stated questions ---no question mark), and weak transitions between paragraphs and ideas.
5. Provide both the aspects of the paper that are working as well as the areas of the paper that are not. This will help the writers identify what they should retain within the paper and what should be revised.

Receiving Feedback: Writers

1. It is hard to receive critical feedback; in fact, it can hurt. Remind yourself that the comments are not directed at you or even at YOUR writing but at this sample of writing. The comments will contribute to your writing success—hold them close. “Good writers” are like unicorns, they are mythic beings, found in fantasy, there is simply good writing. Any writer, no matter how accomplished, is guilty of producing crap. It requires practice, patience, and effort to write well, revision is the key to lovely, clear writing (generally this is at least a quarter of the time spent in writing).
2. Do not interrupt your evaluators while reviewers are providing feedback, this can sound defensive and create an unsafe place for providing feedback. You will have an opportunity to ask questions or clarify concerns once the reviewers have finished their review.
3. It is a good idea to take notes during the evaluation; this gives you something to do while the reviewers discuss the writing. Also consider if there is significant agreement (i.e., inter-rater reliability) among all of your reviewers. At times, they will likely disagree, when this happens you will need to use your judgment about what to revise.

MEANINGFUL PAGE NUMBERS IN THE STYLE GUIDE:

Writing tips and suggestions for writing style – Pg. 61-129

– “Et als” Rule – Pg. 175

– When to use i.e., e.g., etc., and how to punctuate with them – Pg. 108

- Title length (no more than 12 words). Pg. 241
- Does the byline reflect the institution, city and state (NOT the professor and date)? P. 241
- Are the margins 1 inch? Is the entire document double-spaced? Are all the fonts the same throughout? Pg. 241
- Are all abbreviations initially spelled out and followed by the parenthetical abbreviations →
E.g., Pacific University (PU)