Review Article Guidelines for Students on Rotation

A.T. Still University of Health Sciences
Kirksville College of Osteopathic Medicine

Table of Contents

A. How to Write A Review Article

1. Prologue

A review article differs from a research article in that the review article examines the evidence presented *in* a research article, rather than producing research itself. Daryl J. Bem of Cornell University describes a review article as the following experience: "You have surveyed an experimental literature and arrived at conclusions you believe are worth sharing with the wider…community. Now it is time to write. To publish. To tell the world what you have learned.

"According to the recent revision of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*,

"review articles, including meta-analyses, are critical evaluations of material that has already been published. By organizing, integrating, and evaluating previously published material, the author of a review article considers the progress of current research toward clarifying a problem. In a sense, a review article is tutorial in that the author

- Defines and clarifies the problem;
- Summarizes previous investigations in order to inform the reader of the state of current research;
- Identifies relations, contradictions, gaps, and inconsistencies in the literature; and
- Suggests the next step or steps in solving

the problem. (American Psychological Association [APA], 1994, p.5) (In Bem)."

2. Getting Started

2.1 **The bad news:** There are two things nobody wants to hear about writing:

1) Writing is hard.
2) Writing takes time.

I'm not sure which is worse, but both are true, so you might as well resign yourself to them right now and get it over with.

2.2 **The good news**: The above truisms hold for everyone, even the most seasoned writers. And there are some tried and true ways to make the writing easier.

3. Writing as Critical Thinking

3.1 A common misconception that writers have is that they know or should know what they are going to say before they begin. In order for this to be true, writers would need to memorize ten to twenty pages' worth of material and then spew them onto the pages. This is not possible.

Your life as a researcher, student, and writer will be more pleasant for you if you learn now that writing is a *form of thinking.* Writing helps you organize your thoughts, not vice versa.

3.2 **"Aha!"**
Often, when you are writing, you will have an "aha!" experience in which you discover that you thought or knew something you didn't realize you thought or knew. Writing has helped you to think of it. Putting the words on the page has led you to a discovery that wouldn't have been possible merely through thinking or speaking.

The "aha!" writing experience is very similar to what happens to athletes once they are warmed up during a run: they enter a zone in which they feel they can run forever. Often, though, this happens *only after* the first couple of miles.

For writers, the "aha!" moment happens after a few pages. However, for the writer, unlike the athlete, there is a strong temptation to ignore the new direction the "aha!" discovery has brought because it often renders the first few pages of writing obsolete.

It is important, therefore, for you to accept the fact right now that unless you are a highly seasoned

writer, and have been writing for perhaps fifty years, you are going to have to view the first few pages of everything you write as a warm –up lap whose only function is to get you to the "aha!" experience and which you will later recycle. Hence, writing takes time, and paper.

It is crucial not to ignore the "aha!" portion of your writing: This is your strongest writing and thinking. You may be halfway through your review article and have an inspiration that requires you to re-write the entire article. It is highly tempting to ignore that inspiration, then, in hopes of not having to re-write. However, the good news is that when you are inspired, when you have warmed up, the revision will happen very quickly and almost on its own. It will not require the time or energy of the first draft, and it will have energy, innovation, and strong thinking in its favor. It is the point of writing.

4. What's the Point of Your Article?

4.1 Whenever busy people such as your examiners read anything, they are likely to ask, "Why am I reading this?

- Why should I read this?
- What is the point?"

4.2 The answer examiners have after reading your review article should not be that they have to read this because the project was assigned. And your answer to the question, 'Why are you writing this?' better not be 'Because I had to in order to pass.'

4.2 One of the most significant challenges any scholar, researcher, educator, writer must overcome is the relevancy question, the answer to the question, "So What?"

- Why are you reading this manual right now? Because you have to write a review article and you want to pass the first time.
- Why am I writing this manual right now? Because I am an experienced writer, have taught writing at the university level, and have figured out a few things about solving the relevancy problem.

4.4 If you cannot figure out a relevant reason for you to be writing the review article, then you might as well stop wasting your own time and that of your reader.

4.5 If you cannot figure out a relevant reason for you to be writing the review article, a reason outside of, "I have to fulfill this assignment," or "I want to get this published," then you will not pass. You have not thought about this enough. You have not written

about this enough. Everyone can write well about things they have thought a lot about. So, think about it a lot:

- Why are these articles interesting to you?
- Why did you choose to write about them?
- Do they present a new procedure?
- Is there a significant gap in theliterature?
- Do these articles contribute important new knowledge to the field?
- Are these articles mistaken?
- Are you disagreeing with them?

5. Argument

5.1 Another concept you must understand before you begin writing is that ***anytime you are writing, you are making an argument***. Everything is an argument. If you learn the components of an argument, your article will be successful. A commonly used argument is known as the Toulmin Argument, which contains the following components:

Claim: The claim is the statement you wish to make.
Example: "Don't eat the mushrooms!"

Reason: The logic behind the claim.
Example: "Because they are poisonous!"

Warrant: The warrant answers the question of "So What?" that is posed to the reason. It is often implied and often obvious, but arguments win or fail dependent on whether people accept the warrant.
Example: "Eating poisonous mushrooms will make you sick!"

Evidence: Supports the reason.
Example: Medical literature shows that the mushrooms you intend to eat are poisonous and will make you sick.

5.2 Some arguments are more successful than others. Here is an example of a weak argument:

Claim: Don't eat that chocolate!
Reason: It will make you fat!
Warrant: Being fat is means you will have to replace your clothes at great expense!
Evidence: Chocolate is high in fat and calories.

However, for most people, the taste and small amount of chocolate they will eat make that argument weak. Also, the amount of weight you'd need to gain to make that warrant true takes enough time not to be an immediate deterrent. There are problems with the warrant and, the argument is easy to take apart.

5.3 Here is a stronger argument:

Claim: Take your purse with you when you go to the bathroom.
Reason: If you leave it at the table, it might get stolen.
Warrant: If someone steals your purse, you have to replace your credit cards, driver's license, checkbook, cellphone, prescriptions, passport, and whatever else you have in your purse. You may never replace the cash.
Evidence: Many people who leave their purses unattended experience theft.

For most people, this warrant is more compelling than the one for not eating chocolate, and more likely to make them listen to your claim.

5.4 In your writing, you need to figure out your own argument.
- What is your claim?
- What are your reasons?
- So What?
- What is your evidence?
- Is it fact-based, anecdotal, or emotional?

5.5 Sometimes, before you can answer all of these questions you must first think of who will be reading your review article.

6. Audience

6.1 Again, it might seem obvious who your audience is: the evaluator of your review article.

- Again, this is not good enough.
- For one thing, do you know this person?
- What do you know about them?
- And is this the only person ever who will be reading your review article?

6.2 Instead of focusing on your reviewer, think of a specific journal you would like to submit your review article to.

- Would you like to share your observations with hospital administrators so a policy can be changed?
- Do you think a formerly criticized procedure should be re-visited?
- Would you like to share new medical information or a new procedure with other doctors?
- Are you interested in sharing something with other student doctors?
- Or is your angle perhaps the patients themselves or their relatives?
- If you focus your review article and your

argument on a specific audience, then you are halfway there.

6.3 Your audience will give your writing a focus and an edge. Knowing who your audience is helps you rhetorically. Most pieces of writing attempt one of two purposes:

a. to make the audience see something differently
b. to make the audience act on the information in a specific way
c. What are you hoping review article will accomplish? You will be essentially arguing for one of the above two things to happen.

7. Pre-Writing and Brainstorming

7.1 You are finally ready to begin writing. This will be your warm up lap, the writing that will help you get where you need to go, so view it that way without planning, necessarily, to use it in your final product.

7.2 The first thing you are going to do is write for 30 minutes without stopping and think of every possible angle of your review article, writing without editing. This is called thick description. Then, you are going to walk away from this piece for a few hours.

7.3 You will do two more pre-writes of 30 minutes each during a 48-hour period. These pre-writes are essential to producing a good review article. It is here that you will discover what you think is interesting about your angle, who you are trying to reach, and it is here that you will remember little details that might otherwise have escaped you.

- After you have finished your third pre-write and left it for an hour or so, examine all three of your pre-writes and see what you find most interesting in all of them.
- What have you repeated?
- What seems to be the most important theme or detail?
- Who seems to be the most logical audience for this review article?
- What can you argue for?

7.4 Now you are ready to take your three pre-writes and begin writing a rough draft. And I do mean rough. Again, you are not thinking in terms of revision. You are thinking on paper and generating material.

B. The Structure of Review Article

Unfortunately, cohesive instructions for writing review articles do not exist. Therefore, it seems prudent to structure the review article around the argument you are

making, incorporating the elements of the Toulmin Argument into your structure. For the elective research practicum, the following structure is provided:

1.   The Abstract

1.1 The abstract must be 200 words **or less.** Such a writing task is among the most difficult to achieve. **I highly recommend that you wait until you have written the rest of your review article to write the abstract.**

- The abstract will be a brief synthesis of the entire project, the teaser, which will help readers determine immediately whether your review article can be useful.
- It should also be interesting enough to warrant a reading of the entire article.
- It is here that you will first raise the issue of your argument.
- Your abstract and your introduction may end up being very similar.

1.2 I am going to state here and emphasize later that your writing, although it is academic and medical in nature, has a responsibility to be both *interesting and* important.

2.   Introduction

2.1 Again, brevity is important. **Less than 200 words.** And again, this should be one of the last portions of your review article that you write.   Nobody will know that you wrote it last, and when you think about it, you can introduce best those people you know the best; how can you write an introduction for a paper you haven't written yet? You don't know yet how it will turn out.

- This is a brief introduction to the article.
- Includes the highlights of the articles.
- Establish your audience and address your relevancy (so what, why am I reading this?) questions here.
- Establish your persuasive purpose: the reader should either see things differently or be prepared to do something as a result of reading this. Alert audience to your intended result now.
- **You will want to anticipate audience argument in response to what you are proposing and then rebut that argument with your own.**
- You cannot wait until the discussion section to bring these issues into focus.

2.2 Sample Introduction (completely made up)

Psychologists disagree about whether hypnosis, as a therapy, should be used in patients who may have experienced childhood trauma. Criticisms of hypnosis include lack of training in practitioners, lack of evidence that hypnosis works; and skepticism about the scientific rigor of hypnosis as a therapy. However, three new articles about hypnotherapy address these criticisms and strongly support the use of hypnotherapy as a safe, reliable, and effective means of treating patients with suspected childhood trauma.

2.3 Commentary on Sample Introduction

Immediately, there is both relevancy and interest. The argument is being established and will be continued as the review article continues, with evidence given in the discussion section where the strongest part of the argument will be given.

Also, the audience counter-argument is raised immediately and ground work is laid for rebuttle.

The introduction is also free of jargon and fewer than 200 words.

3. Claim (also invented)

Remember that your claim is the statement of argument. What you are advocating will provide the spine of your review article, making it both relevant and interesting.

3.1   Sample Claim:

A specific form of hypnotherapy should be adopted by psychologists for use with patients who have possible childhood traumas. (If you are advocating adoption of more than one form of hypnotherapy, you may want to outline them briefly in your introduction and then divide your paper into sections, labeled according to the different methods. For example:
     Music Hypnotherapy
     Claim
     Reason
     Evidence

     Water Hypnotherapy
     Claim
     Reason
     Evidence

     Etc.)

4.   **Reason**:

The article by Author A shows that Form 1 of hypnotherapy yielded such and such results.

4.1   There is a great temptation to reveal everything you have learned so far in medical school here by making this section jam-packed with jargon. Fight that urge. Make your language clear. If you say EKG, spell it out first, and say what it is for. *Your reviewer is not necessarily your only or your most important reader. Make it reader-friendly for many possible audiences.*

4.2   You will need to include some **background** for your claim in this section, in order for your reasons to make sense, and for the full extent of your purpose to be clear.

5.   Evidence

You will summarize the article/s that support your claim and your reasons here. You will want to remember warrants at this time (for a discussion of warrants, refer to the previous section about argument). Your argument will rise or fall unless you can link your evidence to your reasons effectively, tying together the big picture, the answer to the important question of "So What? Why is this important?"

6.   Discussion

6.1   Your discussion section is the one in which you will be the most political, the most impassioned, and the one in which you will tie your argument together. You will summarize the reasons and evidence you have given and explain why the adoption of your argument will improve patient care, research, clinical practices, policy, or whatever you are advocating.

6.2   Another important component of your discussion section is what further research needs to be done, what courses of action need to be taken next. You want your reader to finish the article knowing exactly what point of view you are advocating, and what you want the reader to do about it:

- To be less likely to dismiss hypnotherapy as an effective treatment;
- To consider being trained in hypnotherapy treatment;
- To adopt hypnotherapy in the treatment of patients with suspected childhood trauma;
- To fund more research studying the efficacy of hypnotherapy;
- Etc.

7.   References

Check your style manual, make sure your I's are dotted and your T's are crossed.

C. Your Second Reader

Now that you have written every section of your review article, it is time to have a trusted friend read it for you and make comments.

- ? Is it interesting?
- ? Does it make sense?
- ? Does it have too much jargon?
- ? Does it flow? (Does one section acknowledge that there was a section before it and that there will be one after it?)
- ? Is the review article in a logical right order?
- ? Does the review article raise and answer the question "So What?"
- ? Do you feel persuaded to the writer's point of view?
- ? If you are not persuaded, do you at least understand what the writer was attempting to persuade you to do or think?
- ? Does the author anticipate and rebut audience counter-argument?

D.   The Revision

Depending on how much pre-writing you have done, you will now need to revise. Print out your review article. Let it sit for a day. Then, read it through once without your pen. Finally, read it once again and write on it. Rewrite it again, and then you are done. The important thing to do is to realize that because it takes time, you must pace yourself. Give yourself time to think about the articles you have read and your arguments, to brainstorm and to pre-write, and then to write and revise. If you give yourself time between drafts, you will be able to see more clearly the revisions to make and how to make review article a significant contribution to the literature.

E. Recommended Reading

Bem, Daryl J.   "Writing a Review Article for Psychological Bulletin." *Psychological Bulletin*, 1995, Vo. 118, No. 2, 172-177.

Lunsford, Andrea and Ruskiewics, John. 1998. *Everything's An Argument*. New York, NY. Bedford St. Martin's.

(Examples found on p. 15 were first published in the above textbook).

B. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SCORING REVIEW ARTICLES

The Holistic Approach

Research in composition studies shows that the holistic approach to scoring any piece of student writing is the most accurate, yielding the most agreement among groups of graders in any setting.

Holistic grading simply means that you examine the piece of writing as a whole, subjectively, before you make objective comments. In order to grade holistically, first read the entire review article from start to finish without a pen in hand. Trust your instincts as to the overall quality of the work. After your initial reading, you will mark a P or an F for Passing or Failing on the subjective portion of your scoring guide.

The Scoring Key
The scoring key is designed to provide you quickly and easily with a vocabulary for explaining the subjective score to the students. You have a scoring key for each section of the review article (7 total), which are labeled and included in the back of this manual. You will become so familiar with the elements of the scoring key after you have marked it for the **Abstract** and the **Introduction** that using it will take no time at all. Note the scoring key with 1 to 5 rankings correlates with the quality of the case study (i.e., the higher the scores marked, the better quality case study).

For example, you might have the following boxes marked for the **Discussion Section** of the Review Article.

3= *Satisfactory content and presentation without expansion*
- ? Addresses relevancy question
- ? Not interesting, but adequate response
- ? Appropriate headings and organization
- ☒ Content appropriate to headings.
- ☒ Some attention to audience
- ? Some rhetorical (persuasive) planning: get audience to see something differently or to act
- ? Formulaic organization which does not necessarily advance the argument being made

4= *Good representation in content and presentation in quality*
- ☒ Abstract and review article are interesting and relevant
- ☒ Effective response to the writing task
- ? Skill in using language
- ? Clear rhetorical planning: audience will see something differently or be persuaded to act
- ? Development with appropriate support and integration of sources
- ? Clear attention to needs of audience
- ☒ Critical thinking clearly demonstrated—clear understanding of the task at hand and how to address it

SCORE FOR THIS SECTION: 4

The Written Review Article Evaluation Form
After you have marked the criteria for each section of the review article, you can simply review the sheets, and one such as the example above would indicate a score of **4** or possibly **3.5**, depending on how strong you feel the writing was, for the **Discussion Section**. You will write the score for each section on the bottom of each scoring key, as in the above example. Then, you simply write the scores for each section on the evaluation form.

For example, your evaluation form would then look like this:

8. DISCUSSION   **4**

Discussion was a concise review of the articles as they defended the author's argument. The Discussion tied all of the articles together and concluded with a relevant application of how adoption of the argument will improve patient care (or change policy, etc.—the challeng the author has outlined in the paper).

The student will immediately be able to determine, from the vocabulary I have provided you on the scoring keys, the reasoning for the score, and you will not have to make comments on the papers.

C. SCORING KEY: ABSTRACT AND TITLE PAGE

1= *Absent or poor in content and presentation*
- ? Incomplete or inappropriate response to the writing task
- ? Text lacks proper organizational components (sections are either missing or in the wrong order; information meant for one section is in another)
- ? Usage and syntactical errors so severe that meaning is obscured
- ? An accumulation of errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure, which impede reading

2= *Basic content included; presentation poor*
- ? Review article is not relevant
- ? An accumulation of errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure, which impede reading
- ? Little or inappropriate detail to support ideas
- ? Content inappropriate to heading (i.e. material from introduction belongs in discussion, etc.)
- ? The point of the discussion section does not match introduction, abstract, title, etc.
- ? List-like and formulaic writing rather than narrative style

3= *Satisfactory content and presentation without expansion*
- ? Addresses relevancy question
- ? Not interesting, but adequate response
- ? Appropriate headings and organization
- ? Content appropriate to headings.
- ? Some attention to audience
- ? Some rhetorical (persuasive) planning: get audience to see something differently or to act
- ? Formulaic organization which does not necessarily advance the argument being made

4= *Good representation in content and presentation in quality*
- ? Abstract and review article are interesting and relevant
- ? Effective response to the writing task
- ? Skill in using language
- ? Clear rhetorical planning: audience will see something differently or be persuaded to act
- ? Development with appropriate support and integration of sources
- ? Clear attention to needs of audience
- ? Critical thinking clearly demonstrated—clear understanding of the task at hand and how to address it

5= *Excellent representation; publishable quality*
- ? Abstract and review article interesting and contribute valuable new knowledge to the field
- ? Consistent skill in using language
- ? Synthesis of ideas using a variety of sources
- ? Full development with appropriate support from the sources
- ? Consistent attention to the needs of readers
- ? Audience sees author's point (learns something new) or is persuaded to act
- ? Clear and correct organization of materials in appropriate sections
- ? Strong discussion section and conclusion

SCORE FOR THIS SECTION: _____

COMMENTS:

D. SCORING KEY: INTRODUCTION

1= *Absent or poor in content and presentation*
- ? Incomplete or inappropriate response to the writing task
- ? Text lacks proper organizational components (sections are either missing or in the wrong order; information meant for one section is in another)
- ? Usage and syntactical errors so severe that meaning is obscured
- ? An accumulation of errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure, which impede reading
- ? Inadequate selection of articles to review

2= *Basic content included; presentation poor*
- ? Review article is not relevant
- ? An accumulation of errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure, which impede reading
- ? Little or inappropriate detail to support ideas
- ? Content inappropriate to heading (i.e. material from introduction belongs in discussion, etc.)
- ? The point of the discussion section does not match introduction, abstract, title, etc.
- ? List-like and formulaic writing rather than narrative style
- ? Inadequate selection of articles to review

3= *Satisfactory content and presentation without expansion*
- ? Addresses relevancy question
- ? Not interesting, but adequate response
- ? Appropriate headings and organization
- ? Adequate choice of articles to review
- ? Content appropriate to headings.
- ? Some attention to audience
- ? Some rhetorical (persuasive) planning: get audience to see something differently or to act
- ? Formulaic organization which does not necessarily advance the argument being made
- ? Addresses counter-argument

4= *Good representation in content and presentation in quality*
- ? Abstract and review article are interesting and relevant
- ? Effective response to the writing task
- ? Skill in using language
- ? Clear rhetorical planning: audience will see something differently or be persuaded to act
- ? Development with appropriate support and integration of sources
- ? Clear attention to needs of audience
- ? Critical thinking clearly demonstrated—clear understanding of the task at hand and how to address it
- ? Addresses counter-argument and rebuts it

5= *Excellent representation; publishable quality*
- *?* Abstract and review article interesting and contribute valuable new knowledge to the field
- *?* Consistent skill in using language
- *?* Synthesis of ideas using a variety of sources
- *?* Full development with appropriate support from the sources
- *?* Consistent attention to the needs of readers
- *?* Audience sees author's point (learns something new) or is persuaded to act
- *?* Clear and correct organization of materials in appropriate sections
- *?* Strong discussion section and conclusion
- ? Addresses counter-argument and rebuts it effectively

SCORE FOR THIS SECTION: _____
COMMENTS:

E. SCORING KEY: CLAIM

1= *Absent or poor in content and presentation*
- ? Incomplete or inappropriate response to the writing task
- ? Text lacks proper organizational components (sections are either missing or in the wrong order; information meant for one section is in another)
- ? Usage and syntactical errors so severe that meaning is obscured
- ? An accumulation of errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure, which impede reading

2= *Basic content included; presentation poor*
- ? Claim is not relevant
- ? An accumulation of errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure, which impede reading
- ? Little or inappropriate detail to support ideas
- ? Content inappropriate to heading (i.e. material from introduction belongs in discussion, etc.)
- ? The point of the discussion section does not match introduction, abstract, title, etc.
- ? List-like and formulaic writing rather than narrative style

3= *Satisfactory content and presentation without expansion*
- ? Addresses relevancy question
- ? Not interesting, but adequate response
- ? Appropriate headings and organization
- ? Content appropriate to headings.
- ? Some attention to audience
- ? Some rhetorical (persuasive) planning: get audience to see something differently or to act
- ? Formulaic organization which does not necessarily advance the argument being made

4= *Good representation in content and presentation in quality*
- ? Claim is interesting and relevant
- ? Effective response to the writing task
- ? Skill in using language
- ? Clear rhetorical planning: audience will see something differently or be persuaded to act
- ? Development with appropriate support and integration of sources
- ? Clear attention to needs of audience
- ? Critical thinking clearly demonstrated—clear understanding of the task at hand and how to address it

5= *Excellent representation; publishable quality*
- *?* Claim interesting and contribute valuable new knowledge to the field
- *?* Consistent skill in using language
- *?* Synthesis of ideas using a variety of sources
- *?* Full development with appropriate support from the sources
- *?* Consistent attention to the needs of readers
- *?* Audience sees author's point (learns something new) or is persuaded to act
- *?* Clear and correct organization of materials in appropriate sections
- *?* Strong discussion section and conclusion

SCORE FOR THIS SECTION: _____

COMMENTS:

F. SCORING KEY: REASON

1= *Absent or poor in content and presentation*
- ? Incomplete or inappropriate response to the writing task
- ? Text lacks proper organizational components (sections are either missing or in the wrong order; information meant for one section is in another)
- ? Usage and syntactical errors so severe that meaning is obscured
- ? An accumulation of errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure, which impede reading

2= *Basic content included; presentation poor*
- ? Reason is not relevant
- ? An accumulation of errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure, which impede reading
- ? Little or inappropriate detail to support ideas
- ? Content inappropriate to heading (i.e. material from introduction belongs in discussion, etc.)
- ? The point of the discussion section does not match introduction, abstract, title, etc.
- ? List-like and formulaic writing rather than narrative style

3= *Satisfactory content and presentation without expansion*
- ? Addresses relevancy question
- ? Not interesting, but adequate response
- ? Appropriate headings and organization
- ? Content appropriate to headings.
- ? Some attention to audience
- ? Some rhetorical (persuasive) planning: get audience to see something differently or to act
- ? Formulaic organization which does not necessarily advance the argument being made

4= *Good representation in content and presentation in quality*
- ? Review is interesting and relevant
- ? Effective response to the writing task
- ? Skill in using language
- ? Clear rhetorical planning: audience will see something differently or be persuaded to act
- ? Development with appropriate support and integration of sources
- ? Clear attention to needs of audience
- ? Critical thinking clearly demonstrated—clear understanding of the task at hand and how to address it

5= *Excellent representation; publishable quality*
- *?* Reason is interesting and contribute valuable new knowledge to the field
- *?* Consistent skill in using language
- *?* Synthesis of ideas using a variety of sources
- *?* Full development with appropriate support from the sources
- *?* Consistent attention to the needs of readers
- *?* Audience sees author's point (learns something new) or is persuaded to act
- *?* Clear and correct organization of materials in appropriate sections
- *?* Strong discussion section and conclusion

SCORE FOR THIS SECTION: _____

COMMENTS:

G. SCORING KEY: EVIDENCE

1= *Absent or poor in content and presentation*
- ? Incomplete or inappropriate response to the writing task
- ? Text lacks proper organizational components (sections are either missing or in the wrong order; information meant for one section is in another)
- ? Usage and syntactical errors so severe that meaning is obscured
- ? An accumulation of errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure, which impede reading

2= *Basic content included; presentation poor*
- ? Evidence is not relevant
- ? An accumulation of errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure, which impede reading
- ? Little or inappropriate detail to support ideas
- ? Content inappropriate to heading (i.e. material from introduction belongs in discussion, etc.)
- ? The point of the discussion section does not match introduction, abstract, title, etc.
- ? List-like and formulaic writing rather than narrative style

3= *Satisfactory content and presentation without expansion*
- ? Addresses relevancy question
- ? Not interesting, but adequate response
- ? Appropriate headings and organization
- ? Content appropriate to headings.
- ? Some attention to audience
- ? Some rhetorical (persuasive) planning: get audience to see something differently or to act
- ? Formulaic organization which does not necessarily advance the argument being made

4= *Good representation in content and presentation in quality*
- ? Evidence is interesting and relevant
- ? Effective response to the writing task
- ? Skill in using language
- ? Clear rhetorical planning: audience will see something differently or be persuaded to act
- ? Development with appropriate support and integration of sources
- ? Clear attention to needs of audience
- ? Critical thinking clearly demonstrated—clear understanding of the task at hand and how to address it

5= *Excellent representation; publishable quality*
- *?* Evidence is interesting and contribute valuable new knowledge to the field
- *?* Consistent skill in using language
- *?* Synthesis of ideas using a variety of sources
- *?* Full development with appropriate support from the sources
- *?* Consistent attention to the needs of readers
- *?* Audience sees author's point (learns something new) or is persuaded to act
- *?* Clear and correct organization of materials in appropriate sections
- *?* Strong discussion section and conclusion

SCORE FOR THIS SECTION: _____

COMMENTS:

H. DISCUSSION

1= *Absent or poor in content and presentation*
- ? Incomplete or inappropriate response to the writing task
- ? Text lacks proper organizational components (sections are either missing or in the wrong order; information meant for one section is in another)
- ? Usage and syntactical errors so severe that meaning is obscured
- ? An accumulation of errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure, which impede reading

2= *Basic content included; presentation poor*
- ? Discussion is not relevant
- ? An accumulation of errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure, which impede reading
- ? Little or inappropriate detail to support ideas
- ? Content inappropriate to heading (i.e. material from introduction belongs in discussion, etc.)
- ? The point of the discussion section does not match introduction, abstract, title, etc.
- ? List-like and formulaic writing rather than narrative style

3= *Satisfactory content and presentation without expansion*
- ? Addresses relevancy question
- ? Not interesting, but adequate response
- ? Appropriate headings and organization
- ? Content appropriate to headings.
- ? Some attention to audience
- ? Some rhetorical (persuasive) planning: get audience to see something differently or to act
- ? Formulaic organization which does not necessarily advance the argument being made

4= *Good representation in content and presentation in quality*
- ? Discussion is interesting and relevant
- ? Effective response to the writing task
- ? Skill in using language
- ? Clear rhetorical planning: audience will see something differently or be persuaded to act
- ? Development with appropriate support and integration of sources
- ? Clear attention to needs of audience
- ? Critical thinking clearly demonstrated—clear understanding of the task at hand and how to address it

5= *Excellent representation; publishable quality*
- *?* Discussion is interesting and contribute valuable new knowledge to the field
- *?* Consistent skill in using language
- *?* Synthesis of ideas using a variety of sources
- *?* Full development with appropriate support from the sources
- *?* Consistent attention to the needs of readers
- *?* Audience sees author's point (learns something new) or is persuaded to act
- *?* Clear and correct organization of materials in appropriate sections
- *?* Strong discussion section and conclusion

SCORE FOR THIS SECTION: _____

COMMENTS:

I. SCORING KEY: REFERENCES

1= *Absent or poor in content and presentation*
- ? Incomplete or inappropriate response to the writing task
- ? Text lacks proper organizational components (sections are either missing or in the wrong order; information meant for one section is in another)
- ? Usage and syntactical errors so severe that meaning is obscured
- ? An accumulation of errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure, which impede reading

2= *Basic content included; presentation poor*
- ? An accumulation of errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure, which impede reading
- ? Incorrect style
- ? Content inappropriate to heading ?   The point of the discussion section does not match introduction, abstract, title, etc.

3= *Satisfactory content and presentation without expansion*
- ? Appropriate headings and organization
- ? Content appropriate to headings.
- ? Some attention to audience

4= *Good representation in content and presentation in quality*
- ? Effective response to the writing task
- ? Skill in using language
- ? Good presentation
- ? Attention to audience
- ? Appropriate headings and organization

5= *Excellent representation; publishable quality*
- ? Effective response to the writing task
- ? Skill in using language
- ? Good presentation
- ? Attention to audience
- ? Appropriate headings and organization
- ? Correct use of style

SCORE FOR THIS SECTION: _____

COMMENTS:

J. WRITTEN REVIEW ARTICLE EVALUATION FORM

I.   SUBJECTIVE SCORE AFTER INITIAL READING:
(Mark a P for Passing or an F for Failing)   _____

II.   OBJECTIVE SCORE AFTER CLOSE READING:
(Use scoring key on following page, apply to each section of the case study)   _____

    1.   ABSTRACT and TITLE PAGE: _____
        Abstract was 200 words or less; interesting summary of facts and importance of case invited the reading of the article.

    2.   INTRODUCTION: _____
        Less than 200 words and reflects an introduction to the argument and important highlights of the articles reviewed. Author anticipates and rebuts reader counter-argument.

    3.   CLAIM: _____
        Claim is a concise statement of argument, so purpose is clear.

    4.   REASONS: _____
        Reasons match the claim and seem reasonable and arguable.

    5.   EVIDENCE: _____
        Well thought-out review of the articles. Demonstrates an understanding of the articles by describing their findings and applying them to the argument at hand.

    6.   DISCUSSION   _____
        The author ties together the components of the persuasive argument, and proposes a plan of action for the reader.

    7.   REFERENCES: _____
        References were well-respected, current texts and journal articles, written in an appropriate format.

TOTAL SCORE: _____

15 points will be subtracted for each week the paper is late. Passing is 50 points. The paper is worth a total of 70 points (2 points per item, or x2). The final grade will be recorded on your transcript. Students with a score of less than 50 points will be required to repeat the Written Review Article (total of __ contact hours). The student will be required to pay tuition for the repeated review article.