

RESEARCH PROJECT: The Outline

Peer Review Evaluation Sheet for Draft II



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:				
1 = Significant Revision (Very Weak); 2 = Moderate Revision (Weak)	YES	NO	Line No	Revision Rating
3 = Minor Revision (Moderate); 4 = Revision Unnecessary (Strong)				
METHOD				
Participants				
1. Does the participant section ONLY contain participant and sampling info?				
2. For experiments (or quasi-expts), did the authors conduct a power analysis?				
3. Are participants' mean age and SDs listed for each group in the sample?				
Measures				
4. Does the author provide background information on any measures used in the study?				
5. Are all measures cited?				
6. If there is equipment cited in the study, are specific brands, makes, and software described?				
Procedure				
7. Are the procedures clearly defined around the predictions?				
8. Are the variables outlined through the predictions clear?				
9. Are the procedures easy to follow and replicable?				
10. If protocols are discussed are there examples in the appendix?				
11. Is “recipe language” avoided (e.g., “first we...; then we...; next we...”)				
RESULTS				
12. Does the author discuss each proposed statistical test relative to the hypothesis it will answer?				
13. Does the author cite appropriate descriptive assessments they will conduct?				
14. Does the author include parenthetical references to tables/figures?				
15. If questionnaires were used did they propose to conduct a Cronbach's alpha reliability test for internal consistency between their participants' scores?				
16. Are the statistical assessments cited for the predictions appropriate?				
WRITING				
17. Since this is a proposal, did the authors use the future tense?				
18. Does the author use 1st person plural and only when referring to fellow researchers?				
19. Is the bulk of the paper written in active verb voice?				
20. Are all sentences complete (conversely not fragments)?				
21. Did the author maintain formal empirical language (i.e., no colloquialisms, clichés or slang?)				
22. Is the APA formatting correct for headers, citations, etc?				
23. Are all abbreviations first written out with a parenthesis following it to demonstrate the abbreviation? E.g., State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI)				
24. Is the spelling and grammar (i.e., semi colon, commas, spelling) largely correct?				
25. Did the author avoid contractions (do not use “don't” in formal writing)?				
				Total Revision Points (104):
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 (30 pts):

EXAMPLES FOR WRITING YOUR RESULTS

Refer to Pages 125–167 of APA Style Guide

Example 1:

It was predicted that self-reported sex-drive would vary based on the exercise condition (e.g., resistance, endurance, or mindfulness). In order to test this prediction, we plan to conduct a one-way analysis of variance. In an effort to assess the homogeneity of response on the Sex Drive Scale, we will conduct a Cronbach's alpha internal consistency analysis.

Example 2:

It was predicted that technological distraction would result in poor performance on a reading comprehension task. In an effort to assess the accuracy of this prediction we plan to conduct a Pearson's r correlation between number of phone checks with reading times and accuracy in response items.