

## **Submission Requirements**

The following requirements are provided to authors. As a peer reviewer, please familiarize yourself with the requirements and keep them in mind as you review articles.

## **Focus and Scope**

JMGR provides George Mason University (Mason) and the broader academic community a quality peer reviewed, open access journal of graduate and faculty research. This edition will focus on the topic of Innovations in Higher Education.

## **Format and Style**

Each manuscript must be formatted using one of three styles, the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 6th edition* (APA), the *Chicago Manual of Style, 16<sup>th</sup> edition* (CMS), or *Modern Language Association, 7<sup>th</sup> edition* (MLA). Each manuscript should contain the following items: title page with full title and subtitle (if any); abstract of 150 words; up to 6 keywords. Manuscripts should be between 4000-7000 words. Please submit all documents as a word document. PDFs will not be reviewed.

Articles must be written in English. Use a clear, readable style, avoiding jargon. Authors should refrain from using language that is demeaning to a persons' age, gender, gender identity, race, ethnicity, culture, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, disability, language or socioeconomic status. Furthermore, authors are required to adhere to Mason's Code of Student Ethics. Failure to adhere to these guidelines will result in an automatic rejection. Authors are responsible for obtaining permissions from copyright holders for reproduction of any illustrations, tables, or lengthy quotations previously published elsewhere. Any information submitted that does not adhere to this policy will be submitted to the appropriate office (Office of Academic Integrity and/or Provost's Office) as an accusation of plagiarism and/or copyright infringement.

The review process for manuscripts is an anonymous and blind-review. Therefore, authors should remove all material that is considered identifying information. Authors should not refer to themselves or any of their published work with indentifying information. If an author cites himself, please use the name "Author" and the publication date (Author, 2013). For co-authored publications, place "Author" where your name would appear in the citation.

## **Review Process**

Submitted manuscripts are forwarded to a peer review board composed of graduate students and mentoring faculty members. The Editor's Committee and at least two peer reviewers will review each article. All reviews are conducted blindly. For the purpose of blind refereeing, the full names of each author should be supplied on a separate sheet along with current affiliations, contact information, and short biographical notes. Authors should take responsibility for ensuring that they cannot be identified in any way in the main body of the paper in order to protect anonymity (see above for more details).

The English Language Institute (ELI) and Writing Center at George Mason provide resources for international and multilingual students seeking help with manuscript preparation.

## **Peer Review Board**

The Peer Review Board consists of graduate students at Mason who are mentored by faculty members. These individuals are committed to sound research and scholarship and represent an array of graduate disciplines at Mason. Peer reviewers are required to attend a peer review training to ensure manuscripts are reviewed fairly and objectively. At least two peer reviewers will review each manuscript and each reviewer will have two weeks to review the manuscript. Reviewers will complete a score sheet based on the attached rubric and may provide in-text comments for the article.

## **Process**

Authors will be notified of the receipt of their manuscript. After an initial review by the editors, those manuscripts that meet specifications will be sent to peer-reviewers. Authors are also notified with comments if manuscripts are deemed inappropriate for review. Manuscripts are subject to review by graduate peer-reviewers, the editorial board, the editor's committee, and mentoring faculty members.

## **Reviewer Score Sheet**

Use the Reviewer Rubric that follows to determine **scores (1-5)** for each category. Copy-and-paste completed form into comments section during review.

### **Score (1-5) ..... Category**

#### **General**

- ..... Problem/Topic
- ..... Literature Review
- ..... Research Questions/Objectives
- ..... Focus
- ..... Images, Graphs, Tables, Figures
- ..... Abstract
- ..... Quality of Writing
- ..... Formatting and Style

#### **Methods**

- ..... Participants/Themes
- ..... Setting/Databases
- ..... Time Frame
- ..... Appropriateness
- ..... Selection
- ..... Theoretical Framework

#### **Procedures**

- ..... Replication
- ..... Data Collection I
- ..... Data Collection II

#### **Results & Discussion**

- ..... Data Analysis
- ..... Clarity of Findings
- ..... Variance of Findings
- ..... Generalizations of Findings
- ..... Implications
- ..... Conclusions & Recommendations
- ..... Contribution to the Field

#### **Overall Rating of the Manuscript (choose 1)**

- ☐ Accept Submission
- ☐ Revisions Required
- ☐ Decline Submission

#### **Comments:**

## Reviewer Rubric

The following statements may be used to help guide the evaluation of the suitability of articles submitted to JMGR. Please use this rubric to complete the Reviewer Score Sheet.

General	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Problem/Topic</b>	The choice of problem/ topic is not related to focus and scope of the journal.	The choice of problem/ topic is barely related to focus and scope of the journal.	The choice of problem/ topic is generally related to focus and scope of the journal.	The choice of problem/ topic is largely related to focus and scope of the journal.	The choice of problem/ topic is clearly related to focus and scope of the journal.
<b>Literature Review</b>	The presentation of related literature is not appropriate and not objective, i.e., points of view are not included.	The presentation of related literature is barely appropriate and objective, i.e., points of view are barely included.	The presentation of related literature is generally appropriate and objective, i.e., some points of view are included.	The presentation of related literature is appropriate and objective, i.e., a variety of points of view are included.	The presentation of related literature is clearly appropriate and objective, i.e., a variety of points of view are included.
<b>Research Questions and/or Objectives</b>	The research questions or the author's objectives are not identified and not presented.	The research questions or the author's objectives are barely identified and barely presented.	The research questions or the author's objectives are generally identified and presented.	The research questions or the author's objectives are identified and presented.	The research questions or the author's objectives are clearly identified and presented.
<b>Focus</b>	The focus of the research does not rest within an identified and delineated methodological, theoretical, or analytic framework (as appropriate to the problem/topic of study).	The focus of the research barely rests within an identified and delineated methodological, theoretical, or analytic framework (as appropriate to the problem/topic of study).	The focus of the research generally rests within an identified and delineated methodological, theoretical, or analytic framework (as appropriate to the problem/topic of study).	The focus of the research rests within an identified and delineated methodological, theoretical, or analytic framework (as appropriate to the problem/topic of study).	The focus of the research rests within a clearly identified and delineated methodological, theoretical, or analytic framework (as appropriate to the problem/topic of study).
<b>Images, Graphs, Tables &amp; Figures (if applicable)</b>	No tables, images, graphs and figures include information that are important to the larger purpose of the paper .	A few tables, images, graphs and figures include information that are important to the larger purpose of the paper and are they are adequately addressed in the text.	Some tables images, graphs and figures include information that are important to the larger purpose of the paper and are they are adequately addressed in the text.	Most images, graphs and figures include information that are important to the larger purpose of the paper and are they are adequately addressed in the text.	All images, graphs and figures include information that are important to the larger purpose of the paper and are they are clearly addressed in the text.
<b>Abstract</b>	There is no abstract.	Abstract is barely adequate and lacks important information.	Abstract is adequate but lacks important information.	Abstract is somewhat simple and concise.	Abstract is simple and concise.
<b>Quality of Writing</b>	The quality and organization of writing is not clear and not organized.	The quality and organization of writing is barely clear and barely organized.	The quality and organization of writing is somewhat clear and somewhat organized.	The quality and organization of writing is clear and adequately organized.	The quality and organization of writing is clear and well organized.
<b>Formatting and Style (APA, CMS, or MLA)</b>	Major problems with style guide & Journal Requirements	Consistent problems with style guide & Journal Requirements	Some problems with style guide & Journal Requirements	Few problems with style guide & Journal Requirements	All style and formatting adheres to style guide & Journal Requirements.

<b>Methods</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Participants/ Themes</b>	The author(s) did not identify who or what they were studying.	The author(s) barely identified who or what they were studying.	The author(s) somewhat identified who or what they were studying.	The author(s) identified who or what they were studying.	The author(s) clearly identified who or what they were studying.
<b>Setting/ Databases</b>	The author(s) did not identify the setting they were studying and/or did not provide how the non-empirical information was gathered.	The author(s) barely identified the setting they were studying and/or barely provided how the non-empirical information was gathered.	The author(s) somewhat identified the setting they were studying and/or somewhat provided how the non-empirical information was gathered.	The author(s) identified the setting they were studying and/or provided how the non-empirical information was gathered.	The author(s) clearly identified the setting they were studying and/or clearly provided how the non-empirical information was gathered.
<b>Time Frame</b>	The author(s) did not identify the time frame for the study.	The author(s) barely identified the time frame for the study.	The author(s) somewhat identified the time frame for the study.	The author(s) identified the time frame for the study.	The author(s) clearly identified the time frame for the study.
<b>Appropriateness</b>	The author(s) method or methods are not appropriate for the study.	The author(s) method or methods are barely appropriate for the study.	The author(s) method or methods are somewhat appropriate for the study.	The author(s) method or methods are generally appropriate for the study.	The author(s) method or methods are clearly appropriate for the study.
<b>Selection</b> (of participants, data set, or literature)	The selection procedures do not represent the empirical or theoretical research on topic.	The selection procedures barely represent the empirical or theoretical research on topic.	The selection procedures somewhat represent the empirical or theoretical research on topic.	The selection procedures represent the empirical or theoretical research on topic.	The selection procedures thoroughly represent the empirical or theoretical research on topic.
<b>Theoretical Framework</b>	A theoretical framework is not woven into the literature and the discussion.	A theoretical framework is barely woven into the literature and in the discussion.	A theoretical framework is somewhat woven into the literature and in the discussion.	A theoretical framework is woven into the literature and in the discussion.	A theoretical framework is clearly woven into the literature and in the discussion.

<b>Procedures</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Replication</b>	Could not be replicated (empirical) and/or does not provide a better understanding of past and current research (non-empirical).	There is little potential for replication (empirical) and/or a better understanding of past and current research (non-empirical).	There is some potential for replication (empirical) and/or providing a better understanding of past and current research (non-empirical).	There is appropriate detail in the study so that it could be replicated (empirical) and/or it provides a better understanding of past and current research (non-empirical).	There is clear detail in the study so that it could be replicated (empirical) and/or can provide a better understanding of past and current research (non-empirical).
<b>Data Collection I</b>	The tools or frameworks used to gather and organize information were not identified and defined.	The tools or frameworks used to gather and organize information were barely identified and defined.	The tools or frameworks used to gather and organize information were somewhat identified and defined.	The tools or frameworks used to gather and organize information were identified and defined.	The tools or frameworks used to gather and organize information were clearly identified and defined.
<b>Data Collection II</b>	The instruments or frameworks used to gather information do not describe the variables or phenomenon being studied.	The instruments or frameworks used to gather information barely describe the variables or phenomenon being studied.	The instruments or frameworks used to gather information somewhat describe the variables or phenomenon being studied.	The instruments or frameworks used to gather information adequately describe the variables or phenomenon being studied.	The instruments or frameworks used to gather information clearly describe the variables or phenomenon being studied.

<b>Results</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Data Analysis</b> (or discussion of literature)	The analysis is not complete and is biased.	The analysis is barely complete and barely unbiased.	The analysis is somewhat complete and somewhat unbiased.	The analysis is complete and unbiased.	The analysis is complete and clearly unbiased.
<b>Clarity of Findings</b>	The findings from the study are not reported.	The findings from the study are barely reported.	The findings from the study are somewhat reported.	The findings from the study are reported.	The findings from the study are clearly reported
<b>Variance of Findings</b> (if applicable)	If the findings appear contrary to past research, the variance is not explained	If the findings appear contrary to past research, the variance is barely explained	If the findings appear contrary to past research, the variance is somewhat explained	If the findings appear contrary to past research, the variance is explained	If the findings appear contrary to past research, the variance is clearly explained
<b>Generalizations of Findings</b> (if applicable)	The findings cannot be generalized to other settings.	The findings barely can be generalized to other settings.	The findings may somewhat be generalized to other settings.	The findings may be generalized to other settings.	The findings clearly can be generalized to other settings.
<b>Implications</b>	The implications of the study are not stated.	The implications of the study are barely stated.	The implications of the study are somewhat stated.	The implications of the study are stated.	The implications of the study are clearly stated.
<b>Conclusions &amp; Recommendations</b>	The conclusions and recommendations do not flow from the results.	The conclusions and recommendations barely flow from the results.	The conclusions and recommendations somewhat flow from the results.	The conclusions and recommendations flow logically from the results.	The conclusions and recommendations clearly and logically flow from the results.
<b>Contribution to the Field</b>	The study does not contribute to the specified field of study.	The study barely contributes to the specified field of study.	The study may contribute to the specified field of study.	The study contributes to the specified field of study.	The study clearly contributes to the specified field of study.

### Overall Rating of the Manuscript

Please check the box that is most appropriate based upon your ratings above.

<b><i>Accept Submission</i></b> (Will be published as if with no modification except minor grammatical and syntax errors.)
<b><i>Revisions Required</i></b> (Publication meets major requirements but revisions are needed. Once resubmitted, the manuscript will be brought straight to the editorial board for approval or rejection.)
<b><i>Decline Submission</i></b> (Manuscript does not meet major requirements and will not have the opportunity to resubmit.)

### Comments

Please give any comments to describe your rationale for any of your ratings above or any other comments you may have.