**Basic writing elements**

A written critique includes a minimum of four basic elements:

* Identification of the material read (or reviewed).
* An abstract of the major ideas.
* An analysis of the content.
* Implications for the particular course, study or field of interest.

The first "things" to look for in an identified reading are the major ideas and contentions of the author. Try to determine the author’s justification for the contentions. Review the supporting data presented. Examine the logic supporting the author’s conclusions. Seek out similarities and differences between what is being propounded by the author and those held by other writers in the field.

In summary, what is the “gist” of contents of the review? Can it be stated in a few paragraphs? What does it mean? What are the implications?

**Outline for post**

Your initial discussion post should conform to this outline:

* Bibliographical Detail
  + Author
  + Title
  + Source
  + Date
* Abstract of Major Ideas - Synthesis of the big ideas of the article reviewed.
* Critical Evaluation of Major Ideas
  + Substantiation of the idea by good logic.
  + Adequacy of supporting arguments and reasoning.
  + Degree to which author’s point of view agrees with your own.
* Implications - What is the meaning of the author’s ideas regarding what needs to be done in the  
  area of interest, i.e., aviation/aerospace, etc.

**Posting criteria**

Post your four paragraph (maximum) article critique, include your article as an attachment (or a link to the article), and then address the following:

* Do you believe the results? Why or why not?
* State the reported confidence interval(s) estimate in two ways:
  + the upper and lower limits
  + the sample proportion ± the error term  
    (don’t forget to include the confidence level)
* State the meaning of the confidence interval(s).
* Can a reported mean of your article data be treated as a value from a population having a normal distribution? Why or why not?

**APA style writing and referencing**