

# PREVIEW ONLY!!!

Review 3-5 articles on your research topic. The review should lead to a hypothesis or research question that you will be writing about later for the second part of the writing assignment. Samples from previous semesters are available on Blackboard. The total length of Part 1 should be 2 - 3 double spaced pages.

## Comments:

### Step 1:

The first step in reviewing your peers' papers is to provide comments that will help them revise their literature review.

Please use the following tips when creating your comments.

- Comment only on the **THREE most important** issues--even if you detect more issues.
- Save your comments in a text editor (e.g., Microsoft Word). Then copy and paste them online.
- Organize comments by using bullets, numbering, or separate lines for each issue.
- Organize comments with the most important issues near the top of the list.
- Be sure to give specific advice for how to fix the problems.
- Include some positive comments. Make sure to explain what was specifically done well.
- Note that none of the aspects focus on low-level writing problems, like typos and simple grammar problems. Your comments should only include low-level writing problems if those problems are so bad that it makes it hard to understand the text.

Comment Entry 1:  
(\*Required)

Does the review end with a stated research problem that can be addressed through research?

Comment Entry 1:  
(\*Required)

Comment Entry 2:  
(\*Required)

Comment Entry 3:

Comment Entry 4:

  
  
  

Comment Entry 5:

  
  
  

**Does the literature review begin with either a statement of the problem, statistics, or a conceptual definition? ( page 35 of Patten)**

Comment Entry 1:  
*(\*Required)*

  
  
  

Comment Entry 2:  
*(\*Required)*

  
  
  

Comment Entry 3:

  
  
  

Comment Entry 4:

  
  
  

Comment Entry 5:

  
  
  

**Does review discuss strengths and weaknesses in sampling, instrumentation, and/or experimental controls?**

Comment Entry 1:  
*(\*Required)*

  
  
  

Comment Entry 2:  
*(\*Required)*

  
  
  

Comment Entry 3:

  
  
  

Comment Entry 4:

Comment Entry 5:

  
  
  

**Are the articles reviewed reports of research studies?**

Comment Entry 1:  
*(\*Required)*

  
  
  

Comment Entry 2:

  
  
  

Comment Entry 3:

  
  
  

**If there were some common problems at the basic writing level (spelling/grammar, poor word choice, awkward sentence structures), please describe the type of problem including the location of one instance.**

Comment Entry 1:  
*(\*Required)*

  
  
  

Comment Entry 2:

  
  
  

Comment Entry 3:

  
  
  

Comment Entry 4:

  
  
  

Comment Entry 5:

  
  
  

**Does the review present a topic-by-topic synthesis and NOT a series of abstracts?**

Comment Entry 1:  
*(\*Required)*

Comment Entry 2:  
*(\*Required)*

  

Comment Entry 3:

  

Comment Entry 4:

  

Comment Entry 5:

  

**Is the quality of the reseach articles discussed?**

Comment Entry 1:  
*(\*Required)*

  

Comment Entry 2:  
*(\*Required)*

  

Comment Entry 3:

  

Comment Entry 4:

  

Comment Entry 5:

  

**Are ideas presented with few or no quotations used?**

Comment Entry 1:  
*(\*Required)*

  

Comment Entry 2:

Comment Entry 3:

  
  
  

**are in-text citations according to APA standards?**

Comment Entry 1:

(\*Required)

  
  
  

Comment Entry 2:

(\*Required)

  
  
  

Comment Entry 3:

  
  
  

Comment Entry 4:

  
  
  

Comment Entry 5:

  
  
  

**Are gaps in the literature noted, such as gaps in sampling?**

Comment Entry 1:

(\*Required)

  
  
  

Comment Entry 2:

(\*Required)

  
  
  

Comment Entry 3:

  
  
  

Comment Entry 4:

  
  
  

Comment Entry 5:

  
  
  

**Ratings:**

**Based on your comments above, how would you rate the writing mechanics?**

- Excellent- there were no typos, or spelling errors and the APA formatting of in-text citations and the References were perfect
- Very good - only one or two errors of spelling, punctuation or writing style were noted
- 5
- No spelling or punctuation errors were noted, but some errors of APA citations were noted
- 3
- 2
- Very Poor- numerous spelling and punctuation errors were noted and numerous violations of APA style were also noted

**Based on your comments above, how would you rate the content of this literature review?**

- Excellent - the review synthesizes information, moves from topic to topic, identifies gaps in the literature and critically reviews studies
- Good- All but one of the content comments were identifiable
- Very Good but two of the content comments were not identifiable
- Average- Most content comments were identifiable, but the articles reviewed were not clearly related to each other
- 3
- 2
- Poor - Only one or none of the content comments can be identified

**Based on your comments above, how would you rate the critical thinking of this paper?**

- Excellent - the strengths and weaknesses of the studies are clearly identified, gaps in the research are identified and the statement of need for the proposed study clearly follows from this analysis
- Very good
- Good
- Average- One or two strengths or weaknesses were identified but it was not clear how these could be addressed in future research
- 3
- Poor- little critical evaluation provided
- Very Poor- the strengths and weaknesses were not identified and it was not clear what further research is needed

**Based on your comments above, how would you rate the organization of this paper?**

- Excellent - begins with statement of problem area, statistics or a conceptual definition,

flows from topic to topic and ends with research question to be addressed. No quotations are used

Most organization comments were identified but the review was a series of abstracts, not a synthesized review. One quotation used

5

Average -Most comments were identifiable, but the sub-topics did not flow smoothly from one to another

3

2

Poor - none of the organization comments could be identified