

## QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH ARTICLE CRITIQUE GUIDELINES

**Instructions: Please critique the research article of your choice by addressing the following questions. This project is worth 10 points, and 0.1 point will be deducted from the total points for each question missed or for each wrong response to the following questions.**

### Writing Style

Is the article well written (concise, grammatically correct, avoids the use of jargon)?

Yes, overall it's well written, but the language can tone down to be more reader friendly. And there are occasional spelling and grammatical errors in the manuscript.

Is it well laid out and organized?

Yes, especially regarding how purpose of the study is set up.

### Report Title

Is the title clear, accurate, and unambiguous?

Yes, the title clearly tells it's a scale development and validation study.

### Abstract

Does the abstract offer a clear overview of the study, including the research problem, Sample, methodology, findings, and recommendations?

Yes, but sample information was missing, and no recommendations were mentioned.

### Statement of the Phenomenon of Interest

Is the Phenomenon to be studied clearly identified?

Yes, that is, a lack of measure on culturally responsive teaching from students' perspectives.

Are the phenomenon of interest and the research question consistent?

Yes, the authors made a case about the importance of looking at cultural competence from students' stance.

### Purpose/Significance of the Study

Is the purpose of the study/research question clearly identified?

Yes, to develop and validate a scale.

### Logical Consistency

Does the research report follow the steps of the research process in a logical manner?

Yes, but with too much detail at times, such as IRB procedure, which makes it look more like a dissertation than a concise journal article.

Do these steps naturally flow and are the links clear?

Yes. For example, the authors differentiated students' perceptions from teachers' self-reports of culturally responsive teaching to justify the importance of their study.

### Literature Review

Is the review logically organized?

Yes, but can be condensed.

Does it offer a balanced critical analysis of the literature?

Yes, both strengths and weaknesses of previous studies are addressed in the review.

Is the majority of the literature of recent origin?

Not really, some of the literature is outdated and should be more recent. For example, Howard has more recent publications on cultural competence than the cited one in 2001.

Is it mainly from primary sources and of an empirical nature?

Not really, a big portion of it is of conceptual nature.

### **Theoretical Framework**

Has a conceptual or theoretical framework been identified?

Yes, that of Siwatu and Ladson-Billings

Is the framework adequately described?

Yes, but maybe not for the novice reader. Also too many citations make the framework vague and loose.

Is the framework appropriate?

It needs more clarity, especially why such framework is adopted.

### **Aims/Objectives/Research Question/Hypotheses**

Have aims, objectives, research questions or hypotheses been identified?

Yes, but research questions are missing.

Are they clearly stated?

For the most part, but the hypotheses need more rationale for justification purposes.

Do they reflect the information presented in the literature review?

Not really, the factors are reflected, but not why school belonging and teacher support are used for convergent validity.

### **Sample**

Has the target population been clearly identified?

Not really, I assume it was Hispanic as it was the largest group that responded to the survey (63.9%).

How were the sample chosen?

I don't know, other than they were 7<sup>th</sup> grade students in the same school district.

Was it a probability or a non-probability sample?

A non-probability sample.

Is it of adequate size?

Yes, 748 students participated.

Are the inclusion/exclusion criteria clearly identified?

No, information not available.

Are the notes on the demographics of the participants taken?

Yes, although I am not sure if teenagers are able to tell if a teaching pedagogy is culturally responsive or not.

### **Ethical Considerations**

Were the participants fully informed about the nature of the research?

Yes, both in oral and written forms,

Was the autonomy/confidentiality of the participants guaranteed?

Not mentioned.

Were the participants protected from harm?

Not sure. No mention of this in the manuscript.

Was ethical permission granted for the study?

Yes, parental guardian.

**Operational Definitions**

Are all the terms, theories, and concepts mentioned in the study clearly defined?

No, I still have no idea of what culturally responsive teaching means to teenage students.

**Methodology**

Is the research design clearly identified?

Yes, EFA and CFA.

Is the study experimental or non-experimental?

Non-experimental

Has the data gathering instrument been described?

Yes, both teacher support and school belonging measures are described in detail.

Is the instrument appropriate?

Yes, psychometric report is acceptable..

How was it developed?

From literature regarding culturally responsive pedagogy and items from the CRTSE and CRTOE.

Were reliability and validity testing undertaken and the results discussed?

Yes, cronbach's alpha, test-retest reliability, and convergent validity.

Was a pilot study undertaken?

Yes, with five students.

**Data Collection/Data Analysis**

What type of data and statistical analysis was undertaken?

Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analyses...

Was it appropriate? Yes..

How many of the sample participated? 61.5%

**Findings/Discussion**

Are the findings linked back to the literature review? Yes

If a hypothesis was identified, was it supported?

Yes, but the first hypothesis was not supported.

Was practical significance addressed along with statistical significance?

Practical significance is missing, no effect size is reported.

Were the strengths and limitations of the study including generalizability discussed?

Yes, replicate to a different population.

Was a recommendation for future research made?

Yes, but predictive and divergent validity of the instrument should also be addressed in future research.

**References**

Were all the books, journals, and other media alluded to in the study accurately referenced?

Mostly yes, but some references are not correctly listed.

For example (page 23):

Howard, T. (2001). POWERFUL PEDAGOGY FOR AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS. *Urban Education*, 36(2), 179. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.