

Jeffrey Cahan, (2004) suggests that you can structure your critique in two ways:

- § Itemise the argument into main point, reasons for argument, supp

any experiential or experimental evidence given, why not? If there is, why?

- § Is the evidence accurate and is it sufficient to back up the points being argued
- § Is the text and evidence presented appropriate for the intended audience? *E.g. If teachers are the intended audience, then it would be inappropriate, in most cases, for a computer specialist to present an article from a highly technical perspective.*

- 
- § How does this article relate to other reading which you have done in this subject area?
  - § Was the counter argument fully considered? What was it?
  - § What assumptions have been made and how do these assumptions weaken or impact the argument?
  - § Were the implications of accepting the argument of the article fully explained?
  - § Are there aspects to the paper which raise a strong response? If so why?
  - § Where the argument of the article leads to possible applications of the theory, were these practical or meaningful?

- § You have identified the sources; now identify what each source is saying in support of your author's argument
- § What evidence is being used to support the argument?
- § Section headings will give a good insight into supporting points given for an argument
- § Does the author present the evidence to back up a point made, to illustrate a point, or to engender sympathy towards an argument?  
e.g. startling statistics
- § Is there any experiential or experimental