Review criteria

1) For papers and posters

Theoretical underpinning

Is the work well grounded in previous research? Are the research questions and hypotheses theoretically contextualised? For theory-based papers (i.e. those that propose a new framework, or reinterpret earlier studies), is the discussion substantive/thought-provoking/insightful?

A study with a clear theoretical context deserves a 7, provided that hypotheses are also tested (in empirical studies) and connected to other relevant research. An unfocused study that is not theoretically (or methodologically) contextualised deserves a 1. An empirical study without clear and specific research questions and without reference to previous research also deserves a 1.

Originality

How original is the reported work in terms of its theoretical and/or methodological contributions?

Please rate on the scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is the lowest and 7 the highest level of originality.

Rigour

Does the author provide sufficient information about the participants, materials, procedures, analyses, or theories and models? Are the claims well supported by the data? Is the design an appropriate way of approaching the specific research issue?

Please rate on the scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is the least and 7 the most rigorous study.

Clarity

Is the research presented in an organised way? Are the ideas internally consistent and well linked to each other?

Please rate on the scale from 1 (lowest) to 7 (highest).

Significance

How would you rate the significance of the contribution to the field of second language research?

Choose 7 for a highly significant contribution, 1 for a contribution of low significance.

Overall impression

Please give your overall impression, with a 7 meaning 'definitely accept', and a 1 meaning 'definitely reject'.

Reviewer confidence

How confident are you in your judgements about this abstract?

Choose 7 for very confident, 1 for very uncertain.

Motivation of overall impression

Please feel free to enter your motivation for your overall impression here (optional), and to supply detailed comments to back up your rankings. Evaluations, including motivation of overall impression and detailed comments, will be forwarded to the authors of the paper. The comments will help the committee decide the outcome of the paper, and will help justify this decision for the authors. Hence, the more detailed you make your comments, the more useful your review will be - both for the committee and for the authors.

Confidential comments for the committee

You may wish to withhold some comments from the authors, and include them solely for the committee's internal use. For example, you may wish to write something which would expose your identity to the authors. If you wish to share confidential comments with the organising committee only, this is the place to put them.

2) For doctoral workshops

Relevance to the workshop audience

The student was asked to list one or two questions to ask the audience, which will form the basis for a 10-15-minute discussion with the audience. How likely is it that the questions being asked will be of general interest to workshop audiences?

Please rate the proposed questions on a 7-point scale (1 = The questions are exclusively of interest to the student him/herself, and 7 = The questions are likely to be of general interest to the workshop audience). An intermediate rating could go for instance to questions that are likely to be of marginal interest to the audience, or to be of interest to only a small group within the audience.

Significance

How would you rate the significance of the questions and of the research project to the field of second language research?

Choose 7 for a highly significant contribution, choose 1 for a contribution of low significance.

Rigour

The student has been asked to provide an abstract for a 10-15 minutes presentation. The presentation should provide enough context to frame the questions that have been asked. Based on your reading of the abstract, does it look like the presentation will provide sufficient information about the participants, materials, procedures, analyses, or theories and models, to provide the necessary context for the questions being asked?

Please rate on the scale from 1 to 7. 7 is an abstract that promises a presentation that will provide enough information to frame the student's questions, 1 is an abstract that promises an inadequate framing of the question(s).

State of completion and likelihood of instructive discussion

Has the study (data collection and data analyses) already been completed or not?

1: A study that has already been completed, including data analyses, deserves a 1. A study that has not yet been completed, leaving sufficient room for feedback, potentially fruitful and

instructive not only for the researcher herself or himself but also for other researchers in the audience, deserves a 7.

Originality

How original is the reported work in terms of its theoretical and/or methodological contributions?

Please rate on the scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is the lowest and 7 the highest level of originality.

Clarity

Is the research presented in an organised way? Are the ideas internally consistent and well linked to each other?

Please rate on the scale from 1 (lowest) to 7 (highest).

Overall impression

Please give your overall impression, with a 7 meaning 'definitely accept', and a 1 meaning 'definitely reject'.

Reviewer confidence

How confident are you in your judgements about this abstract?

Choose 7 for very confident, 1 for very uncertain.

Motivation of overall impression

Please feel free to enter your motivation for your overall impression here (optional), and to supply detailed comments to back up your rankings. Evaluations, including motivation of overall impression and detailed comments, will be forwarded to the authors of the paper. The comments will help the committee decide the outcome of the paper, and will help justify this decision for the authors. Hence, the more detailed you make your comments, the more useful your review will be - both for the committee and for the authors.

Confidential comments for the committee

You may wish to withhold some comments from the authors, and include them solely for the committee's internal use. For example, you may wish to write something which would expose your identity to the authors. If you wish to share confidential comments with the organising committee only, this is the place to put them.

3) For colloquia

Theoretical underpinning

Is the work well grounded in previous research? Are the research questions and hypotheses theoretically contextualised? For theory-based colloquia (i.e. those that propose a new framework, or reinterpret earlier studies), is the discussion substantive/thought-provoking/insightful?

A colloquium with a clear theoretical context deserves a 7, provided that hypotheses are also tested (in empirical studies) and connected to other relevant research. An unfocused

colloquium that is not theoretically (or methodologically) contextualised deserves a 1. An empirically-orientated colloquium without clear and specific research questions and without reference to previous research also deserves a 1.

Range and coherence

Considering all the proposals submitted within the colloquium, is there a good balance between range and coherence?

7 meaning 'very coherent, with each study contributing new insights', and a 1 meaning 'unrelated studies, with very limited range'.

Originality

How original is the proposed colloquium in terms of its theoretical and/or methodological contributions?

Please rate on the scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is the lowest and 7 the highest level of originality.

Rigour

For the colloquium as a whole, do the authors provide sufficient information about the participants, materials, procedures, analyses, or theories and models? Are the claims well supported by the data? Is the design an appropriate way of approaching the specific research issue?

Please rate on the scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is the least and 7 the most rigorous colloquium proposal.

Significance

How would you rate the significance of the contribution to the field of second language research?

Choose 7 for a highly significant contribution, 1 for a contribution of low significance.

Overall impression

Please give your overall impression, with a 7 meaning 'definitely accept', and a 1 meaning 'definitely reject'.

If you have some serious reservations about individual components of the colloquium, and you believe the colloquium should be accepted but without that/those components, tell us in one of the comments sections bellow.

Reviewer confidence

How confident are you in your judgements about this colloquium proposal?

Choose 7 for very confident, 1 for very uncertain.

Motivation of overall impression

Please feel free to enter your motivation for your overall impression here (optional), and to supply detailed comments to back up your rankings. Evaluations, including motivation of overall impression and detailed comments, will be forwarded to the authors of the paper. The comments will help the committee decide the outcome of the paper, and will help justify this decision for the authors. Hence, the more detailed you make your comments, the more useful your review will be - both for the committee and for the authors.

Confidential comments for the committee

You may wish to withhold some comments from the authors, and include them solely for the committee's internal use. For example, you may wish to write something which would expose your identity to the authors. If you wish to share confidential comments with the organising committee only, this is the place to put them.