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1. Introduction

The introduction should briefly place the study in a broad context and highlight why it is important. It should define the purpose of the work and its significance. The current state of the research field should be carefully reviewed and key publications cited. Please highlight controversial and diverging hypotheses when necessary. Finally, briefly mention the main aim of the work and highlight the principal conclusions. As far as possible, please keep the introduction comprehensible to scientists outside your particular field of research.

(Sample)

Student ratings and evaluations of instruction have a long history as sources of information about teaching quality (Berk, 2013). Student evaluations of teaching (SETs) often play a significant role in high-stakes decisions about hiring, promotion, tenure, and teaching awards. As a result, researchers have examined the psychometric properties of SETs and the possible impact of variables such as race, gender, age, course difficulty, and grading practices on average student ratings (Griffin et al., 2014; Nulty, 2008; Spooren et al., 2013). They have also examined how decision makers evaluate SET scores (Boysen, 2015a, 2015b; Boysen et al., 2014; Dewar, 2011). In the last 20 years, considerable attention has been directed toward the consequences of administering SETs online (Morrison, 2011; Stowell et al., 2012) because low response rates may have implications for how decision makers should interpret SETs.

2. Materials and Methods

The Materials and Methods should be described with sufficient details to allow others to replicate and build on the published results. Please note that the publication of your manuscript implicates that you must make all materials, data, computer code, and protocols associated with the publication available to readers. Please disclose at the submission stage any restrictions on the availability of materials or information. New methods and protocols should be described in detail while well-established methods can be briefly described and appropriately cited.

Research manuscripts reporting large datasets that are deposited in a publicly available database should specify where the data have been deposited and provide the relevant accession numbers. If the accession numbers have not yet been obtained at the time of submission, please state that they will be provided during review. They must be provided prior to publication.

Interventionary studies involving animals or humans, and other studies that require ethical approval, must list the authority that provided approval and the corresponding ethical approval code.

(Sample)

Response rates and evaluation ratings were retrieved from archived course evaluation data. The archive of SET data did not include information about personal characteristics of the instructor (gender, age, or years of teaching experience), and students were not provided with any systematic incentive to complete the paper or online versions of the SET. We extracted data on response rates and evaluation ratings for 364 courses that had been taught by the same instructor during three consecutive fall terms (2012, 2013, and 2014).

The sample included faculty who taught in each of the five colleges at the university: 109 instructors (30%) taught in the College of Social Science and Humanities, 82 (23%) taught in the College of Science and Engineering, 75 (21%) taught in the College of Education and Professional Studies, 58 (16%) taught in the College of Health, and 40 (11%) taught in the College of Business. Each instructor provided data on one course. Approximately 259 instructors (71%) provided ratings for face-to-face courses, and 105 (29%) provided ratings for online courses, which accurately reflects the proportion of face-to-face and online courses offered at the university. The sample included 107 courses (29%) at the beginning undergraduate level (1st- and 2nd-year students), 205 courses (56%) at the advanced undergraduate level (3rd- and 4th-year students), and 52 courses (14%) at the graduate level.

3. Results

This section may be divided by subheadings. It should provide a concise and precise description of the experimental results, their interpretation, as well as the experimental conclusions that can be drawn.

3.1. Subsection

3.1.1. Subsubsection

Bulleted lists look like this:

* First bullet;
* Second bullet;

Numbered lists can be added as follows:

1. First item;
2. Second item;

3.2. Figures, Tables and Schemes

All figures and tables should be cited in the main text as Figure 1, Table 1, etc.

**(Sample)**

Response rates are presented in Table 1. The findings indicate that response rates for face-to-face courses were much higher than for online courses, but only when face-to-face course evaluations were administered in the classroom. In the Year 3 administration, when all course evaluations were administered online, response rates for face-to-face courses declined (*M* = 47.18%, *SD* = 20.11), but were still slightly higher than for online courses (*M* = 41.60%, *SD* = 18.23). These findings produced a statistically significant interaction between course delivery method and evaluation year, *F*(1.78, 716) = 101.34, *MSE* = 210.61, *p* < .001.[[1]](#footnote-1) The strength of the overall interaction effect was .22 (ηp2). Simple main-effects tests revealed statistically significant differences in the response rates for face-to-face courses and online courses for each of the 3 observation years.[[2]](#footnote-2) The greatest differences occurred during Year 1 (*p* < .001) and Year 2 (*p* < .001), when evaluations were administered on paper in the classroom for all face-to-face courses and online for all online courses. Although the difference in response rate between face-to-face and online courses during the Year 3 administration was statistically reliable (when both face-to-to-face and online courses were evaluated with online surveys), the effect was small (ηp2 = .02). Thus, there was minimal difference in response rate between face-to-face and online courses when evaluations were administered online for all courses. No other factors or interactions included in the analysis were statistically reliable.

**Figure 1**

*This is a figure. Schemes follow the same formatting.*

****

The text continues here.

**Table 1**

*This is a table. Tables should be placed in the main text near to the first time they are cited.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title 1** | **Title 2** | **Title 3** |
| entry 1 | data | data |
| entry 2 | data | data 1 |

*Note:* Tables may have a footer.

The text continues here.

4. Discussion

Authors should discuss the results and how they can be interpreted from the perspective of previous studies and of the working hypotheses. The findings and their implications should be discussed in the broadest context possible. Future research directions may also be highlighted.

(Sample)

Online administration of SETs in this study was associated with lower response rates, yet it is curious that online courses experienced a 10% increase in response rate when all courses were evaluated with online forms in Year 3. Online courses had suffered from chronically low response rates in previous years, when face-to-face classes continued to use paper-based forms. The benefit to response rates observed for online courses when all SET forms were administered online might be attributed to increased communications that encouraged students to complete the online course evaluations. Despite this improvement, response rates for online courses continued to lag behind those for face-to-face courses. Differences in response rates for face-to-face and online courses might be attributed to characteristics of the students who enrolled or to differences in the quality of student engagement created in each learning modality. Avery et al. (2006) found that higher performing students (defined as students with higher GPAs) were more likely to complete online SETs.

Although the average SET rating was significantly lower in Year 3 than in the previous 2 years, the magnitude of the numeric difference was small (differences ranged from 0.08 to 0.11, based on a 0–4 Likert-like scale). This difference is similar to the differences Risquez et al. (2015) reported for SET scores after statistically adjusting for the influence of several potential confounding variables. A substantial literature has discussed the appropriate and inappropriate interpretation of SET ratings (Berk, 2013; Boysen, 2015a, 2015b; Boysen et al., 2014; Dewar, 2011; Stark & Freishtat, 2014).

Faculty have often raised concerns about the potential variability of SET scores due to low response rates and thus small sample sizes. However, our analysis indicated that classes with high response rates produced equally variable SET scores as did classes with low response rates. Reviewers should take extra care when they interpret SET scores. Decision makers often ignore questions about whether means derived from small samples accurately represent the population mean (Tversky & Kahneman, 1971). Reviewers frequently treat all numeric differences as if they were equally meaningful as measures of true differences and give them credibility even after receiving explicit warnings that these differences are not meaningful (Boysen, 2015a, 2015b).

5. Conclusions

This section is not mandatory but can be added to the manuscript if the discussion is unusually long or complex.

6. Patents

This section is not mandatory but may be added if there are patents resulting from the work reported in this manuscript.

**Supplementary Materials:** The following supporting information can be downloaded at: www.mdpi.com/xxx/s1, Figure S1: title; Table S1: title; Video S1: title.

**Author Contributions:** For research articles with several authors, a short paragraph specifying their individual contributions must be provided. The following statements should be used “Conceptualization, X.X. and Y.Y.; methodology, X.X.; software, X.X.; validation, X.X., Y.Y. and Z.Z.; formal analysis, X.X.; investigation, X.X.; resources, X.X.; data curation, X.X.; writing—original draft preparation, X.X.; writing—review and editing, X.X.; visualization, X.X.; supervision, X.X.; project administration, X.X.; funding acquisition, Y.Y. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.”

**Funding:** Please add: “This research received no external funding” or “This research was funded by NAME OF FUNDER, grant number XXX” and “The APC was funded by XXX”. Check carefully that the details given are accurate and use the standard spelling of funding agency names at https://search.crossref.org/funding. Any errors may affect your future funding.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** In this section, you should add the Institutional Review Board Statement and approval number, if relevant to your study. You might choose to exclude this statement if the study did not require ethical approval. Please note that the Editorial Office might ask you for further information. Please add “The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the Institutional Review Board (or Ethics Committee) of NAME OF INSTITUTE (protocol code XXX and date of approval).” for studies involving humans. OR “The animal study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board (or Ethics Committee) of NAME OF INSTITUTE (protocol code XXX and date of approval).” for studies involving animals. OR “Ethical review and approval were waived for this study due to REASON (please provide a detailed justification).” OR “Not applicable” for studies not involving humans or animals.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Any research article describing a study involving humans should contain this statement. Please add “Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.” OR “Patient consent was waived due to REASON (please provide a detailed justification).” OR “Not applicable.” for studies not involving humans. You might also choose to exclude this statement if the study did not involve humans.

Written informed consent for publication must be obtained from participating patients who can be identified (including by the patients themselves). Please state “Written informed consent has been obtained from the patient(s) to publish this paper” if applicable.

**Acknowledgments:** In this section, you can acknowledge any support given which is not covered by the author contribution or funding sections. This may include administrative and technical support, or donations in kind (e.g., materials used for experiments).

**Conflicts of Interest:** Declare conflicts of interest or state “The authors declare no conflicts of interest.” Authors must identify and declare any personal circumstances or interest that may be perceived as inappropriately influencing the representation or interpretation of reported research results. Any role of the funders in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results must be declared in this section. If there is no role, please state “The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results”.

**Appendix A**

The appendix is an optional section that can contain details and data supplemental to the main text—for example, explanations of experimental details that would disrupt the flow of the main text but nonetheless remain crucial to understanding and reproducing the research shown; figures of replicates for experiments of which representative data is shown in the main text can be added here if brief, or as Supplementary data. Mathematical proofs of results not central to the paper can be added as an appendix.
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