

## Paper Preparation Instruction

**Structure:** Title, abstract, introduction, materials/methods, results, discussion, conclusion, references.

**Title and Key words:** The title should be both descriptive and concise. To ensure optimal visibility in search engines and academic databases, it is recommended that it not exceed 15 words.

**Abstract:** Preparing an article requires a structured approach. The article should include a concise abstract of approximately 250 words, without references, a clear and informative title, and a well-organized main body. The abstract must follow the IMRD format (Introduction, Methodology, Results, Discussion/Conclusion) and be accompanied by 3-5 keywords. These keywords should be carefully selected to reflect the article's specific content and to facilitate its discoverability in academic databases.

**Formatting:** Manuscripts must be typed in a standard font (Times New Roman, 12 pt) with 1.5 line spacing.

**Font:** Times New Roman

**Font size:** 12 pt

**Line spacing:** 1.5

**Title:** centred, font size 14 pt, bold

**Author's first name and last name:** centred, font size 12 pt, italic

**Place of employment:** centred, font size 12 pt, italic

**Margins:** right margin 2.5 cm, left margin 2.5 cm, top margin 2.5 cm, bottom margin 2.5 cm (do not indent the first line)

**Figures and tables** should be numbered consecutively, either within the text or as separate uploaded files. Figures should be submitted at a high resolution of 300 dpi for photographs and colour images and 1000 dpi for line graphs. It is recommended that there are no more than 10 figures and tables.

**Appendices** are not a required component, additional materials that supplement the main text may be included after the bibliography if necessary. They are cited in the main text and designated as "Appendix 1", "Appendix 2" and etc.

**Verification of sources and references** should follow APA style when citing academic works. Please manually check any citations generated by software.

The citation should be written in brackets and include the author's surname(s) and the year of publication. (McCormic, 2026).

If a work is published in the same year as another work by the same author, a lowercase letter is added after the year of publication. For example: (Boysen, 2015a).

If there are two authors, join their last names with "&" (Feistauer & Richter, 2016).

When citing in the text, if there are more than two authors, the surname of the first author is followed by "et al." (Dommeyer et al., 2004), and all authors are listed in the reference list at the end of the paper.

Direct quotations must be accompanied by the corresponding citation with page numbers in parentheses.

## References

A list of sources used, titled “References”, will be placed at the end of the text in accordance with the following guidelines:

- All works cited in the text are listed in the references.
- If a Digital Object Identifier (DOI) is available, it is added to the end of the source.
- The list of references should be arranged in alphabetical order by the authors' surnames.
- If multiple works by the same author are cited, they should be listed in chronological order.
- If the same author is the author of a work, as well as of works he or she has edited, and a co-author, then his or her own work is listed first, followed by the works he or she has edited, and finally the work published in collaboration with others.
- If a book is available in electronic format, this is indicated by the author, year of publication, book title, publisher, and electronic link - author’s last name, initials (year). *Book title*. Publisher. Link (URL) or DOI.
- If the book is available on an online platform and does not have a DOI, the corresponding URL will be provided instead.
- When citing online video content, include the following information: author’s name or channel name; publication date; video title; format; platform; and link. - Author’s name/channel name. (Year, month, day). Video title [video]. Platform. URL.
- A bibliographic citation for a dissertation or master's thesis should include the author's name, the year of publication, the title of the work, the type of work, the name of the university and, if available online, a web link. Author’s last name, initials. (Year). *Title of work* (dissertation, name of university). Database or URL.

### Sample References

(Taken from <https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/paper-format/professional-annotated.pdf>)

- Avery, R. J., Bryant, W. K., Mathios, A., Kang, H., & Bell, D. (2006). Electronic course evaluations: Does an online delivery system influence student evaluations? *The Journal of Economic Education*, 37(1), 21–37. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JECE.37.1.21-37>
- Berk, R. A. (2012). Top 20 strategies to increase the online response rates of student rating scales. *International Journal of Technology in Teaching and Learning*, 8(2), 98–107.
- Berk, R. A. (2013). *Top 10 flashpoints in student ratings and the evaluation of teaching*. Stylus.
- Boysen, G. A. (2015a). Preventing the overinterpretation of small mean differences in student evaluations of teaching: An evaluation of warning effectiveness. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 1(4), 269–282. <https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000042>
- Boysen, G. A. (2015b). Significant interpretation of small mean differences in student evaluations of teaching despite explicit warning to avoid overinterpretation. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 1(2), 150–162. <https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000017>

- Boysen, G. A., Kelly, T. J., Raesly, H. N., & Casner, R. W. (2014). The (mis)interpretation of teaching evaluations by college faculty and administrators. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(6), 641–656. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.860950>
- Buller, J. L. (2012). *Best practices in faculty evaluation: A practical guide for academic leaders*. Jossey-Bass.
- Dewar, J. M. (2011). Helping stakeholders understand the limitations of SRT data: Are we doing enough? *Journal of Faculty Development*, 25(3), 40–44.
- Dommeyer, C. J., Baum, P., & Hanna, R. W. (2002). College students' attitudes toward methods of collecting teaching evaluations: In-class versus on-line. *Journal of Education for Business*, 78(1), 11–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08832320209599691>
- Dommeyer, C. J., Baum, P., Hanna, R. W., & Chapman, K. S. (2004). Gathering faculty teaching evaluations by in-class and online surveys: Their effects on response rates and evaluations. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 29(5), 611–623. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930410001689171>
- Feistauer, D., & Richter, T. (2016). How reliable are students' evaluations of teaching quality? A variance components approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(8), 1263–1279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1261083>
- Gilovich, T., Griffin, D., & Kahneman, D. (Eds.). (2002). *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511808098>
- Griffin, T. J., Hilton, J., III, Plummer, K., & Barret, D. (2014). Correlation between grade point averages and student evaluation of teaching scores: Taking a closer look. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(3), 339–348. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.831809>
- Jaquett, C. M., VanMaaren, V. G., & Williams, R. L. (2016). The effect of extra-credit incentives on student submission of end-of-course evaluations. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 2(1), 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000052>
- Jaquett, C. M., VanMaaren, V. G., & Williams, R. L. (2017). Course factors that motivate students to submit end-of-course evaluations. *Innovative Higher Education*, 42(1), 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-016-9368-5>
- Morrison, R. (2011). A comparison of online versus traditional student end-of-course critiques in resident courses. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(6), 627–641. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602931003632399>
- Nowell, C., Gale, L. R., & Handley, B. (2010). Assessing faculty performance using student evaluations of teaching in an uncontrolled setting. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(4), 463–475. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930902862875>
- Nulty, D. D. (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: What can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(3), 301–314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930701293231>

- Palmer, M. S., Bach, D. J., & Streifer, A. C. (2014). Measuring the promise: A learning-focused syllabus rubric. *To Improve the Academy: A Journal of Educational Development*, 33(1), 14–36. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tia2.20004>
- Reiner, C. M., & Arnold, K. E. (2010). Online course evaluation: Student and instructor perspectives and assessment potential. *Assessment Update*, 22(2), 8–10. <https://doi.org/10.1002/au.222>
- Risquez, A., Vaughan, E., & Murphy, M. (2015). Online student evaluations of teaching: What are we sacrificing for the affordances of technology? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40(1), 210–234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.890695>
- Spooren, P., Brockx, B., & Mortelmans, D. (2013). On the validity of student evaluation of teaching: The state of the art. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(4), 598–642. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313496870>
- Stanny, C. J., Gonzalez, M., & McGowan, B. (2015). Assessing the culture of teaching and learning through a syllabus review. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40(7), 898–913. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.956684>
- Stark, P. B., & Freishtat, R. (2014). An evaluation of course evaluations. *ScienceOpen Research*. <https://doi.org/10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AOFRQA.v1>
- Stowell, J. R., Addison, W. E., & Smith, J. L. (2012). Comparison of online and classroom-based student evaluations of instruction. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(4), 465–473. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2010.545869>
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1971). Belief in the law of small numbers. *Psychological Bulletin*, 76(2), 105–110. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0031322>
- Uttl, B., White, C. A., & Gonzalez, D. W. (2017). Meta-analysis of faculty's teaching effectiveness: Student evaluation of teaching ratings and student learning are not related. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 54, 22–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.08.007>
- Venette, S., Sellnow, D., & McIntyre, K. (2010). Charting new territory: Assessing the online frontier of student ratings of instruction. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(1), 101–115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930802618336>
- Webb, E. J., Campbell, D. T., Schwartz, R. D., & Sechrest, L. (1966). *Unobtrusive measures: Nonreactive research in the social sciences*. Rand McNally.