

# 16 Judging Research: How Should Research and Researchers Be Evaluated and Rewarded?

Fenik Kaml Muhammed

There is a growing demand for transparency and accountability in research evaluation that encourages researchers to develop a comprehensive list of evaluation tools and techniques with their explanation of techniques and ideas that can be applied to assess the value of research. The comprehensive evaluation of advantages and disadvantages of various approaches need to be considered. Long and short term measuring tools need to be considered, for example in the short term measure, the number of publication of researcher, and the audience in the long term measure [1].

To judge the research and researcher, certain points needs to be considered and focused;

## **Abstract**

A strong abstract can clearly describe the purpose, design of the research being conducted, as well as the problem that paper the is attempting to resolve. An abstract also tells the reader about a brief interpretation of the results. The research from the first overview can be evaluated from the abstract as to whether this study or research has a significant impact in the future study and deserve to be explored in detail or not. [3].

## **Objectives**

The author has clearly described the objectives in a detailed manner not in the beginning of the manuscript but in the last paragraph of the introduction after performing an excellent effort of reviewing the current literatures and finding the niche of their own study to present the objectives; it is essential in any paper to have a clear aim of what you are going to be writing about. Although it appears a small point, however, it has a great impact in that it directs the reader to find out how the author followed the objectives and targeted their own aims. The researchers need to clearly define the research question and step by step evaluate and discover the answer to this question and allow the reader to follow the research and identify the relationship and association with other studies [2]. For instance, let the readers distinguish true experimental designs with random assignment from pre-experimental research designs [2].

## **Technical issues**

Using excellent abbreviations for a complex topic that makes the manuscript short and meaningful with saving many words.

An excellent study when performed by a great researcher explains each point of the experimental method in a way that enhances the reader to have the pleasure of discovery and divulges essential details [4].

Presenting a paper with a diagram is worth a thousand words, which lets the reader use their imagination [4].

No personal pronouns are used in the manuscript, in other words, the manuscript is written in a formal academic writing style [4].

An excellent explanation of the result and comparison with other studies to indicate consistency with the current study [4].

The evaluation of research needs to be based on the field of subject area of wide interest of the current science. For example, studies nowadays are focusing on digital instruments and gradually, items are becoming globally digitized rather than using conventional instruments.

To what extent the author has a previous background in this topic, is the idea too simple or an extraordinary idea and worth publishing and even citing. In addition, the author should be evaluated by the number of citations of papers that have been published. Sometimes the paper is cited and read by a large number of other researchers, this means the work has been performed in sequence and answered the relevant questions that the majority of other researchers are looking for.

The evidence suggested that for judging a study or for researcher evaluation, this needs to be performed by an expert with more than twenty years in research.

## **Referencing**

When referencing a previously published article, the author read a wide range of articles that carefully selected the paper to make the claim to support their own paper, especially those that contain little evidence for the claim and make the paper shine in comparison [4]. For evaluation of high-quality research, the researcher needs to select the most appropriate reference for his/her study. Probably not all the references are liable to be included, the point is, a recognizable journal with a clear impact factor and reputation globally need to be focused on and most importantly, the most current reference used instead of the outdated references of the last 50 years, apart from some gold standards that can be used anytime [2].

## Data analysis

The researchers must have a clear background for statistical analysis and the methods that are used for appropriately collected data, and assumptions for their use met. In addition, the presentation of data analysis is very essential for performing high quality research, the data need to be presented in tables or figures must have a clear indication of the variables' impact and be clearly labeled [2].

## Language and originality

Language is also another parameter to be considered when the research scales are evaluated. Strong academic language gives power to the current literature and makes it stand out and allow the reader to enjoy the flow of the writing and scene of the science. The originality of the research is also another crucial point that needs to be considered in evaluating an excellent study and researcher. To what extent is the idea and its content is unique and novel? Whether the writing format is totally taken from other ideas and paraphrased or copied directly. This affects the quality of paper.

To sum-up, this essay described certain points that are essential for choosing a study and researcher, at least three to five experts with twenty years of research are required to evaluate whether this study or person should be rewarded or not under their practical experience and certain standard criteria that are essential for this purpose.

## References

1. Available online: <https://www.rand.org/randeurope/research/projects/evaluating-research.html> (accessed on 15 July 2019).
2. Available online: <https://blog.efpsa.org/2011/08/01/how-to-critically-evaluate-the-quality-of-a-research-article/> (accessed on 12 July 2019).
3. Available online: <https://www.wikihow.com/Evaluate-a-Research-Paper> (accessed on 20 July 2019).
4. Roya, W. Skillful writing of an awful research paper. *Anal. Chem.* **2011**, *83*, 633–633. doi:10.1021/ac2000169.



© 2020 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).