

## Critical Evaluations of two Journal Articles

### General considerations

<b>The critique should be a maximum of five pages long (2000 words) and written in APA style.</b>
<b>Introduction.</b> The statement of the problem is clear and researchable. The article includes: background information, educational significance, and defined variables.
<b>Review of literature.</b> This is comprehensive and is relevant.
<b>Hypothesis.</b> There are specific questions or hypothesis specified. The variables are defined and testable.
<b>Method.</b> The size and characteristics of the studies are defined. There is an appropriate method of sampling.
<b>Instruments.</b> There is a clear rationale for their use. They are adequately described with appropriate referencing.
<b>Design and Procedure.</b> This is appropriate and any limitations are covered.
<b>Results.</b> Appropriate statistics are presented
<b>Discussion (conclusions and recommendations).</b> The results are discussed in terms of the original hypothesis and their generalisability. The strengths and weaknesses are noted and discussed.
<b>Summary.</b> Covers the main salient issues of the article.

**The critique should be put through an originality checking service (e.g. Turnitin) and the feedback report should be provided.**

Grading Rubric	Applicant must score in either the Advanced or Proficient to Pass overall.			
	<b>Advanced</b> <small>Pass</small>	<b>Proficient</b> <small>Pass</small>	<b>Developing</b> <small>Fail</small>	<b>Novice</b> <small>Fail</small>
<b>Content</b>	The critique demonstrated advanced knowledge of the important parts of published research. It also demonstrated evidence of extensive research effort and a depth of thinking about the topic.	The critique demonstrated knowledge of the important parts of published research. It also demonstrated evidence of proficient research effort and/or initial of thinking about the topic.	The critique demonstrated some knowledge of the important parts of published research, evidence of the research effort or depth of thinking about the topic.	The critique did not demonstrate adequate knowledge of the important parts of published research, evidence of research effort or depth of thinking about the topic.
<b>Evidence</b>	All relevant information was obtained and information sources were valid. Analysis and design considerations were well supported by the information.	Sufficient information was obtained and most sources were valid. Analysis and design considerations were mostly supported by the information.	Some information obtained, though not comprehensive. The analysis and design considerations needed to be developed more.	Insufficient information was obtained and/or sources lack validity. Analysis and design considerations were not supported by the information collected.
<b>Perspectives</b>	All perspectives are identified, evaluated and completed. The critique offered new information or approach to the topic.	All perspectives are identified and evaluated but some are not completed. The critique offered some new information or approach to the topic. The application is reasonable; further analysis of alternatives or constraints may have led to a different recommendation.	Many perspectives are identified, evaluated and/or completed. The critique offered limited new information or approach to the topic under discussion. Some application considerations were analysed and other factors were ignored or incompletely analysed.	Many perspectives are not identified, evaluated and/or completed. The critique offered no new information or approach to the topic under discussion. Few application considerations are analysed and other factors were ignored or incompletely analysed.
<b>Writing and organisation</b>	The critique was well organised and clearly written. The underlying logic was clearly articulated and easy to follow. Words were chosen that precisely expressed the intended meaning and supported reader comprehension. Sentences were grammatical and free from errors.	The critique was organised and clearly written for the most part. In some areas the logic and/or flow of ideas were difficult to follow. Words were well chosen with some minor exceptions. Sentences were mostly grammatical and/or only a few spelling errors were present but they did not hinder the reader.	The critique was organized and clearly written for the most part. The reader had to make some effort to understand the underlying logic and flow of ideas. There were a number of grammatical and spelling errors, which impeded the readability.	The critique lacked overall organisation. The reader had to make considerable effort to understand the underlying logic and flow of ideas. Grammatical and spelling errors made it difficult for the reader to interpret the text in places.