

GGR277 Peer-Review Exercise

Name of Reviewer _____ Name of Author _____

After you have read the draft proposal, write responses to the questions in this handout. Please keep in mind that this isn't a question of "right" or "wrong" –rather, you are giving a thoughtful reader's perspective. Return the first review to your TA at the end of tutorial. Return the second to the wooden dropbox labeled GGR277 in the Geography Department by next Tuesday evening (10/21).

Part I: Writing

1. While reading this proposal, were you able to follow the logic of the proposal. (Y/N)
2. Were there places you got lost? If so, where?
3. Were there places you found the expression of the ideas particularly clear? If so, where?
4. A proposal such as this would be intended for a professional audience – either an ethics review board or a funding agency. In what ways does the writing seem professional? In what ways (if any) does it need to be more professional? (Note: the use of the first person is acceptable, but it must be done professionally.)

Part II: Consistency

1. As you were reading the proposal, did you feel that the research question was justified based on the introduction and background information provided? (Y/N)
Please explain your answer.
2. Do you feel that the research design was appropriate for the research question? (Y/N)
Please explain your answer.
3. Do you feel that the research methods chosen would help the author successfully answer their research question? (Y/N)
Please explain your answer
4. Do you feel the research instrument was designed to collect sufficient data to answer the research question? (Y/N)
Please explain your answer
5. Do you feel like the discussion of positionality, ethics, and limitations were all relevant to and consistent with the proposed research? (Y/N)
Please explain your answer

Part III: Description and Rationale

1. After reading this proposal, did you feel like the author gave you enough description for each of the various aspects of the research proposal that you felt like you could visualize what the actual research project would look like? (Y/N)

What sections could have used more description?

What sections had particularly clear and effective description?

2. Providing the rationale behind the research design is particularly important in communicating the strengths of a research project. For each of the topics named below, did the author provide a clear rationale for WHY they made certain choices?

Research Question (is it clear why this is important)? (Y/N)

Research Design? (Y/N)

Research Methods? (Y/N)

Recruitment strategies? (Y/N)

Data Analysis? (Y/N)

Steps taken to address Ethical concerns? (Y/N)

If you have any suggestions to help the author clarify their rationale, please share them here.

Part IV: Abiding to Expectations for Each Section

1. Remembering that an abstract was not required for the draft, did you feel that all of the author had met all of the basic requirements for the proposal (e.g. including all sections, layout requirements, appropriate citations) (Y/N)

Please identify any section or organizational element that was missing in the draft.

2. Did you feel like all of the ideas in the proposal were in the appropriate sections? (Y/N)
If there were pieces that you felt were in the wrong sections, please identify them and suggest where you think they should go.

3. Were the references clear and easy to understand? (Y/N)

4. Did the references look professional? (Y/N)

5. Please skim through the paper again and look to see if you noticed any assertions, quotes, claims, etc. that need citations and don't have them. In other words, are there places where the author is drawing on outside sources, or making claims that need to be backed up by outside sources, but where they haven't provided citations?

6. Were there any places where you felt the author could have used additional references to strengthen their argument? If yes, where and on what topics?