

REVIEW ONLY!!!

Your final paper should contain a revision of the literature review (Paper part 1) plus a draft of your methods section.

Comments:

Is the paper in good, fluent accurate English? Is it well presented in terms of spelling, punctuation and list of references?

Comment Entry 1:
*(*Required)*

Comment Entry 2:

Comment Entry 3:

Comment Entry 4:

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

Comment Entry 1:
*(*Required)*

Comment Entry 2:

Comment Entry 3:

Comment Entry 4:

Comment Entry 5:

Is the reference list at the end formatted correctly using APA style?

Comment Entry 1:
*(*Required)*

Comment Entry 2:
*(*Required)*

Comment Entry 3:

Comment Entry 4:

Comment Entry 5:

Does literature 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:

Were the proposed measures described?

Comment Entry 1:

*(*Required)*

Comment Entry 2:

*(*Required)*

Comment Entry 3:

Comment Entry 4:

Method for obtaining sample is described

Comment Entry 1:

*(*Required)*

Comment Entry 2:

Comment Entry 3:

Comment Entry 4:

Reliability and validity of measures described

Comment Entry 1:

*(*Required)*

Comment Entry 2:

*(*Required)*

Comment Entry 3:

Comment Entry 4:

A research design is described that makes sense for the stated research question.

Comment Entry 1:

*(*Required)*

Comment Entry 2:

Comment Entry 3:

Comment Entry 4:

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:

Ratings:

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 in most aspects but the logic leading to the research question could be improved.
- Good - Room for improvement.
- Average - One or two strengths or weaknesses in past studies were identified but it was not clear how these could be addressed in future research.
- Below average - The articles were not criticized for the most part, or the criticism did not relate to the authors research question/hypothesis.
- Poor - Little critical evaluation provided- review was mostly abstracts without evaluation.
- 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 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.
- Good - Several errors were noted both in the paper and in the citations.
- Average - No spelling or punctuation errors were noted, but some errors of APA citations were noted.
- Below Average - A few spelling and/or punctuation errors.
- Poor - There were many punctuation and typographical errors, making it difficult to read the paper.
- Very Poor - Numerous spelling and punctuation errors were noted and numerous violations of APA style were also noted.

Were the measures used for the independent and dependent variables described?

- all measures described, and the type (e.g., norm referenced, criterion referenced) make sense for this study
- One measure was not adequately described or didn't make sense for the proposed study
- the measures are well-described but they don't seem appropriate for this study
- more than one measure was not described
- 3
- 2
- the measures were not described, just listed.

Describe the basic design proposed for this study (e.g., single subject, randomized group, descriptive, qualitative)

- a design is clearly described and the design makes sense for the stated research question
- 6 the design makes sense for the research question but it's description could be more clearly stated
- 5
- 4
- a design is described or named but it doesn't make sense for the stated research question
- a design is named but it is not described
- there is no design stated

Did the author describe how they will measure reliability of the independent and dependent variables and the validity of any proposed measures?

● methods to measure reliability of all dependent measures, procedural reliability and the validity of measures are clearly described

● reliability and validity for most but not all measures clearly described

● reliability and validity are mentioned but it's not clear how it will be reported (e.g., total vs point by point?)

● reliability of some but not all measures is described; validity of some but not all measures are described

● 3

● 2

● reliability and validity of the proposed measures are not described

Both in-text citations and the References listed at the end of the paper are accurate according to APA standards

● Excellent - All in-text citations and the References listed at the end of the paper are accurate according to APA standards.

● Very good -One or two errors in either in-text or reference citations were noted.

● Good 3 or 4 errors in citations were noted.

● Average -4 errors in citations or references were noted.

● Below average -5 errors in citations or references were noted.

● Poor -Many errors in formatting or spelling of citations were noted.

● Very poor- The author failed to include citations or a reference list.

Close Window