**Evaluate the ESL Research Paper**

**Introduction**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Criteria** | **1-5 (5 being the best)** | **Explain your rating?** |
| 1. | The purpose of the study is clearly articulated in the introduction. |  |  |
| 2. | There was a clear topic, condition, and problem that was articulated in the introduction. |  |  |
| 3. | It’s clear why the study is important. |  |  |
| 4. | The research questions and hypotheses were clearly articulated and not confusing. |  |  |
| 5. | The research questions and hypotheses were explicitly connected to the problem. |  |  |
| 6. | The literature review was easy to follow and was organized in a logical way. |  |  |
| 7. | The literature review included citations to relevant sources. |  |  |
| 8. | You were able to clearly identify a “gap” in the literature. A “gap” is something that is missing in the previous research that the current study will address. |  |  |
| 9. | Rate the overall introduction. Was it clear, easy-to-read, logical, organized, well written? Do you have a clear understanding of what the study is all about after reading the introduction? In the explanation column, clearly outline areas you will focus on as an editor of this document. |  |  |
|  | **TOTAL SCORE:** |  |  |

Additional Notes Regarding the Introduction Section:

**Method**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Criteria** | **1-5 (5 being the best)** | **Explain your rating?** |
| 1. | The method section had enough detail (e.g., like a recipe, could another researcher replicate the study?) |  |  |
| 2. | The methods section clearly outlined the study design. |  |  |
| 3. | Data sources and participants were described in detail. |  |  |
| 4. | The procedure was easy to follow. |  |  |
| 5. | All measures and materials were clearly explained. |  |  |
| 6. | Rate the overall Methods section. Was it clear, easy-to-read, logical, organized, well written? In the explanation column, clearly outline areas you will focus on as an editor of this document. |  |  |
|  | **TOTAL SCORE:** |  |  |

Additional Notes Regarding the Methods Section:

**Results**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Criteria** | **1-5 (5 being the best)** | **Explain your rating?** |
| 1. | The results were objectively reported without any interjection from the writer. |  |  |
| 2. | The results were presented in a logical way (by research question and/or hypothesis) |  |  |
| 3. | The results used graphics and tables in a useful way. |  |  |
| 4. | Rate the overall Results section. Was it clear, easy-to-read, logical, organized, well written? In the explanation column, clearly outline areas you will focus on as an editor of this document. |  |  |
|  | **TOTAL SCORE:** |  |  |

Additional Notes Regarding the Results Section:

**Discussion**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Criteria** | **1-5 (5 being the best)** | **Explain your rating?** |
| 1. | The discussion section presented clear explanations for the results of the study. |  |  |
| 2. | The discussion section clearly outlined the significance or importance of the results. |  |  |
| 3. | The discussion section referenced previous research and compared the results to previous research. |  |  |
| 4. | Limitations of the study were clearly discussed. |  |  |
| 5. | Future research ideas were clearly discussed. |  |  |
| 6. | Rate the overall Results section. Was it clear, easy-to-read, logical, organized, well written? In the explanation column, clearly outline areas you will focus on as an editor of this document. |  |  |
|  | **TOTAL SCORE:** |  |  |

Additional Notes Regarding the Discussion Section: