



JUNIOR RESEARCHERS OF EARLI

PEER REVIEW INSTRUCTIONS PAPERS

Dear JURE participant,

Thank you for your full paper and for taking part in the review process. Your paper will be reviewed by an experienced researcher and a peer participant of the JURE conference. Therefore, you are also required to provide feedback on another participant's paper. By taking part in the review process you will not only get the opportunity to learn from feedback on your own paper, but also enhance your competences by providing feedback and help a fellow PhD student developing his/her research.

Please complete the review by **19th May**. This gives the other participant the opportunity to incorporate your feedback in his/her presentation. You will receive the feedback on your paper at the end of May, provided that you submitted your peer review and are registered to the conference.

For matching the papers we used your SIG information and type of research. However, because of missing papers and not all topics present, the paper assigned to you can still be in a field that you are not familiar with. Nevertheless, try to give as much feedback as possible.

We will use the conference system for the feedback procedure. Here are some instructions about how to access the paper assigned to you and how to include your feedback into the EARLI review system. Please read these instructions carefully!

Important notice:

Your review has to be saved at once, so it is not possible to do half the review and return to the system later to finish it. Once you have saved your review, it is final and cannot be changed in the system. To avoid any problems, please keep a copy of your review on your own computer.

1st step: In order to access the paper that we assigned to you for reviewing, please log in with your EARLI or conference username and password (the same as you used for submitting your paper) on the following website: <http://conference.earli.org/submissionreview>. You will see the title of the paper that we assigned to you. Click on the 'paper and pencil'-button at the right.

2nd step: Download the full paper in the section entitled "Attachments", by clicking on the 'magnifying glass'-button.

If the paper has an unknown format, first try to save it on your computer and change the extension manually to .doc or .pdf. This might be enough to be able to open it in MS Word or Adobe Acrobat Reader. If this is not working, contact us at jure2008@gmail.com.

Please take your time to carefully read the paper you will review and try to provide the same kind and amount of feedback as you would like to have on your own paper.

If you notice that your paper is much longer than the 4000 words (excluding references or appendices) that were requested, you might decide not to read the whole paper. However, we



JUNIOR RESEARCHERS OF EARLI

PEER REVIEW INSTRUCTIONS PAPERS

think it would be very helpful for the participant if you would discuss some parts of it in detail and let him or her know **how** to shorten the paper in general.

There are 2 different kinds of feedback we would like you to provide.

1.) In order to provide the JURE participant with an overview of his/her study's improvable and positive aspects, please use the ranking criteria listed in the system.

To complete a review, you should fill in a score on a scale from 1 to 10 for each criterion.

You would also have to indicate whether you would accept this contribution. This is a fixed question in the conference system, but is not appropriate for our formative feedback phase and will not have any impact on the acceptance decision of the contribution. All participants are already accepted for presentation at the JURE 2008. Therefore, we kindly ask you to click on YES for this question of acceptance.

2.) For an in-depth feedback, which explains your ranking decisions, please use the empty frame / box (no space limitations) given in the system. We want to stress that this second part of the review is the most important part.

We would appreciate it if you would use the template in the **document** (MS Word) **attached to this mail**, with the given issues (introduction, method, etc.). If important issues are missing, please add them to your feedback. When writing the in-depth feedback, please keep in mind that your comments will be transferred directly to the participant, without monitoring by the committee. Please address the participant personally.

For your convenience in writing, we suggest that you first open the attached review document, write your open comments in this text document, and then copy and paste them into the frame of the EARLI review system. Make sure that you save the WORD-document on your computer so that you will be able to retrieve your feedback for the conference.

Last step: When your online review is complete, click on **'save'**. Please note, on the moment that you click on the save button the review cannot be changed anymore.

Preparing discussion questions for the conference

The feedback is a double non-blind procedure. As far as the program allows for, peers who reviewed each other will be scheduled in the same session. Since you are the one who is most familiar with the study among the other conference participants, we kindly ask you to start the discussion after the presentation with a few questions or reflections about the presented research. Therefore we suggest that you already think of some general issues for discussion, and the second attachment is meant as a help in this.

Don't hesitate to contact us if you have any further questions (jure2008@gmail.com).

We are looking forward to receiving your feedback. Thank you very much for taking part in the review process!

Best regards, JURE 2008 Organising Committee

PEER REVIEW INSTRUCTIONS

PAPERS

Dear Reviewer,

For an in-depth feedback that explains your ranking decisions, please comment the following issues (Which aspects need improvement and why? Provide positive examples, if possible. Indicate positive aspects of the study and paper.).

We suggest that you write your open comments in this text document (MS Word), then copy and paste them into the frame of the EARLI review system (no space limits).

01. **Title** (e.g., does the title represent the main concern of the paper?)

02. **Abstract** (e.g., is the abstract an appropriate summary of the paper?)

03. **Introduction / Theoretical background** (e.g., does the introduction present the specific research problem and strategy? Does it summarize theoretical implications and connections with previous studies in the area? Does the closing paragraph explain the selected approach to solve the relevant problem? Are hypotheses given consistent with the given information?)

04. **Analyses** (e.g., are the analyses used appropriately for the research question and kind of data?)

05. **Method** (e.g., does the section present a detailed description of the study's conduction? Does the provided information enable the reader to evaluate the methods and results? Was the design of the study appropriate for the research question?)

06. **Results** (e.g., does the section summarize the collected data and used procedures? Are the reported data detailed to the extent that conclusions can be derived and justified? Does the section contain descriptive facts rather than interpretations? Can the reported data be used to answer the research question?)

07. **Discussion** (e.g., are the results given (and no others) interpreted and evaluated with respect to the original research question? Are the findings related with those of other studies and are these relations explained? Are theoretical consequences and the validity of conclusions emphasized? Are meaning and (practical) relevance of the study disclosed to the reader? Are implications for further research (unanswerable or new research questions) stated?)

08. **Overall impressions** (e.g., did you experience any comprehension difficulties because of insufficient or superfluous information? Was the organization of the paper clear?)



JUNIOR RESEARCHERS OF EARLI

PEER REVIEW INSTRUCTIONS PAPERS

Dear Reviewer,

We kindly ask you to start the discussion after the presentation of your paper with a few questions or reflections about the presented research. Since a plenary discussion at a conference is of a different nature than a personal review, we would like to provide you with some suggestions of how to prepare it.

Since participants received their reviews beforehand, their papers might already be revised by the time of the conference. Therefore, it is not necessary anymore to repeat detailed comments on the structure, the language or the content of the paper. Detailed comments are also not interesting for the other participants in the session, since they have not read the paper.

Some suggestions to reflect on the presentation and to start the discussion are given below.

You don't have to submit these discussion issues in the EARLI review system, but it might be useful to bring them to the conference to assist your memory.

01. What you liked about the study (you can use your positive comments of your written review, but try to generalize them)

02. Your take away point (e.g. one of the things I learned from this study is ..., the conclusion that we should disseminate from this study is ...)

03. Question about the choices made in the research (e.g., why did you choose a certain framework, a certain method of analyses, a certain interpretation of the results?)

04. Implications for further research (e.g. unanswerable or new research questions? Does anyone in the public is doing similar research, and how does it relate to the presented study?)