

# *Journal of Research on Christian Education*

## **Rubric for Reviewers of Research Articles**

Use your ratings in the above categories to guide you in (1) writing your comments to the author(s), (2) comments to the editor (if any), and (3) making your publication recommendation to the editor.

In general, the more 4s and 5s an article receives in your rating, the more likely you will recommend it for publication; likewise the more 1s and 2s you assign the article, the more likely you will recommend revision or rejection. However, interpret your review scores from the rubric through your professional judgment. For example an article may be strong in terms of literature and structure and be well written. However, if it is of little relevance to Christian education or makes no real contribution to the literature, then a recommendation of reject or major revision will be more likely, regardless of scores in the other criteria.

<b>Please rate the manuscript on the following factors:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1. Relevance of Topic/Study to Christian Education</b> (original, important, significant)	Not relevant <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Relevant
<b>2. Literature and/or Empirical Basis</b> (adequate, relevant, research topic is situated in the field)	Not grounded <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly grounded
<b>3. Appropriateness/Rigor of Methodology</b> (conceptually, theoretically, methodologically, and analytically sound)	Poor design <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong design
<b>4. Presentation of Results</b> (clear, accurate analysis, data presented in text if no table needed, Effect Sizes and confidence intervals presented in addition to <i>p</i> values for Quant studies)	Poor presentation of results <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent presentation of results
<b>5. Quality of Interpretations/Conclusions</b> (includes an insightful discussion section, conclusions are supported by evidence from the study)	Poor quality <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> High quality
<b>6. Contribution to the Literature</b> (theoretical and/or practical significance)	Not significant <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly significant
<b>7. Overall Quality of Manuscript</b> (writing, clarity, logic, organization, APA format)	Poor <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
<b>8. Figures, tables, and other supporting material</b> (accurate, clear, necessary, APA format)	Poor quality <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> High quality