

## How to Do the Article Review

You are to write a review of an academic article. This document sets the guidelines for the review. Email the review by January 22, 2013 to [jdubrow2000@yahoo.com](mailto:jdubrow2000@yahoo.com).

In terms of structure and content, the article review has four components: summary, critique, practical suggestions for improvement, and decision (accept, conditional accept, revise & resubmit, or reject).

Summary consists of description of the main topics, research questions, hypotheses and methods of the article. The summary section should also include author's style of writing (academic, informal, journalistic, wordy, breezy, jargon-filled etc.); and the structure of the book (how it is organized).

Critique is evaluation of the article and its main messages. You are to discuss how well, or not, the author addressed the research problem: Include also your suggestion for improving the article, and how well the author's methods are appropriate for addressing the research question. What is the contribution of the article to the literature? Is the paper well organized? If not, why not? Is the writing clear, simple and engaging? A good strategy for structuring book reviews is to put major, more general critiques at the beginning and end with smaller, more minor critiques.

Formatting Guidelines: The book review is to be two full pages, double-spaced, with 12 pt. Times New Roman font, with normal margins (2,5 cm top, bottom, left and right). Unlike a real review, include also a title page that contains the following information only: your name, your university, the title of the article, and the date of review submission. All answers must be in the form of an essay, e.g. no tables or graphs, no pictures, no "bullet point" lists. Pay strict attention to directions on page length: the length is two pages, so the entire second page must be filled with no more than 2 cm of blank space between the end of your review and the bottom margin. You are invited to write more than two pages, but it is not required. The review must be delivered electronically to the instructor's email address. **Any deviations from these guidelines may result in an automatic reduction of ten percentage points.**

You will be graded along three criteria:

Grammar: 10%. I expect a minimum of grammatical, spelling and proof-reading errors.

Organization, or Structure of the Article Review: 20%. The article review must present all main elements of an article review: summary, critique, suggestions for improvement and decision. The simplest is to move from summary to critique. You are free to choose your own structure, so long as it makes sense.

Content: 70%. Here, you will be graded on how well you present your summary and criticisms.

See below for another guideline for reviews that you may find helpful:

### The British Journal of Sociology

#### Guidelines for Assessors

When preparing your written assessment we would be grateful if you could comment on as many of the items contained in the following checklist as you think suitable:

- 1 Is the contribution made in this paper new and substantial with regard to
  - the argument advanced
  - the results obtained
  - the approach followed
- 2 If it does not make a major contribution does it
  - replicate existing work in a competent manner to provide further support/modification to existing

- hypotheses
  - make a modest but worthwhile contribution in some other way
- 3 Is the paper well-structured? For example
- are its theoretical framework, methodology and data closely and appropriately integrated?
  - are the methods employed appropriate?
  - are the stated aims of the paper achieved?
  - is it written clearly, concisely and free of jargon and cliches?
- 4 Does the title give a clear idea about the paper's content and character?
- 5 Is the referencing adequate?
- 6 As part of policy to accelerate the assessment process we are introducing the following category (under the reject selection): 'not of professional standard/not at right level as it stands' to assist assessors where they feel papers are weak or unsuitable for publication.

**Summary Recommendation Sheet - To be seen by Editor only**

Please complete sections A and B and **underline** the categories which are applicable

**A Intellectual value/importance**

- 1 Outstanding/major contribution that has very high priority for publication
- 2 Substantial contribution of interest to *BJS* readership
- 3 Less substantial contribution and/or at the margins of interest to *BJS* readership
- 4 Makes no significant contribution or not within the *Journal's* areas of interest

**B Recommendation to Editor (choose one only)**

- 1 Accept unchanged
- 2 Accept subject to revision (minor revisions)
- 3 Revise and resubmit (revisions so substantial that a provisional acceptance is impossible)
- 4 Reject: not of professional standard / not at right level as it stands
- 5 Reject

**C Length Recommendations (select one only) [the Journal word limit is normally 8-8500 words]**

1. Leave unchanged
2. Minor reduction required
3. Substantial reduction required (please specify where in your attached report)

Any further comments which may help the Editors but which are not to be shown to the author/s

**NB Would you be willing for your name to appear in a List of Assessors in the Journal's end of year Index which is published in the December issue of each volume? YES/NO**