

## SCHOLARLY RESEARCH ARTICLE GROUP REVISION GUIDE<sup>10</sup>

Author: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

INSTRUCTIONS: (1) In groups of three or four, read your papers aloud to each other.  
(2) After each group member reads, complete this editing guide in response to the paper. (3) One member of the group should fill out the guide for the group.

*CHECK appropriate description in each category.*

### A. Introductory paragraph

Introduction of the issue:  
\_\_\_ unclear or incomplete  
\_\_\_ introduced and explained

\_\_\_ introduced but vague  
\_\_\_ introduced and explained clearly and completely  
\_\_\_ imaginatively (or extremely well) introduced  
\_\_\_ issue explained in context  
\_\_\_ both context and issue very clear  
\_\_\_ context presented fully and imaginatively

Presentation of the context:  
\_\_\_ not much context  
\_\_\_ skimpy context

Statement of the thesis:  
\_\_\_ not clearly stated  
\_\_\_ does not call for action

\_\_\_ stated clearly  
\_\_\_ stated clearly, concisely, & completely and calls for action

Is the introduction of the research paper effective? Is the background sufficient?  
Are terms defined? Is the situation set up? If so, briefly explain why. If not, give suggestions for improvement.

### B. Argument and discussion

FIRST SUPPORTING REASON OR ARGUMENT (*circle appropriate number*)

Relation to the thesis:

- 1 - no perceptible relationship
- 2 - only a vague or general relationship
- 3 - related (no misunderstanding)
- 4 - this part of the paper clearly explains and supports the first reason of the thesis
- 5 - the relationship is shown effectively and persuasively

Logic of the argument:

- 1 - no logic or faulty logic
- 2 - some flaws in the argument
- 3 - no serious flaws but perhaps some "suspect elements"
- 4 - this part of the paper is developed logically
- 5 - the logic is sound and persuasive

Quantity and quality of support for the reasons:

- 1 - almost none
- 2 - still not enough
- 3 - minimum supporting discussion and evidence given
- 4 - enough supporting discussion and evidence to be reasonable convincing
- 5 - lots of discussion, and specific evidence effectively presented

SECOND SUPPORTING REASON OR ARGUMENT:

Relation to thesis: 1 2 3 4 5  
Logic of argument: 1 2 3 4 5  
Quantity and quality of support: 1 2 3 4 5

THIRD SUPPORTING REASON OR ARGUMENT:

Relation to thesis: 1 2 3 4 5  
Logic of argument: 1 2 3 4 5  
Quantity and quality of support: 1 2 3 4 5

C. Quotations

- 1 - too few references to other sources; documentation is missing
- 2 - quotes (direct and indirect) are not introduced or discussed; they are strung together without processing
- 3 - some quotes are introduced; some are discussed
- 4 - quotations blend into the paper fairly smoothly; most are both introduced and discussed.
- 5 - quotations are skillfully blended into the paper: sources are introduced with their credentials; the material is discussed and applied.

D. Documentation

- 1 - sources or page numbers are missing in the paper; too few sources in the reference list; those in the list are popular, not professional
- 2 - citation form is incorrect in the paper; a moderate number of sources in the reference list, with a fair balance of sources
- 3 - all sources are cited; citations in paper are in good form; Works Cited form is good, adequate number of sources
- 4 - citations show solid research; form is almost perfect; reference list form is almost perfect; very good number of sources, most of them professional
- 5 - citations show generous research; form is perfect in the paper; reference list has a plentiful number of very credible sources, in perfect form

Any other suggestions?

Members of the editing group: