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- **Content Knowledge** – Students will demonstrate foundational knowledge and skills related to the broad domain of physical activity, and will have the ability to apply perspectives from the humanities and the social, behavioral, and life sciences. (Aligns with ILO number 6, specialized discipline)

- **Professional Application** – Students will be able to identify and integrate relevant information to design, act, and evaluate within disciplinary practice. (Aligns with ILO number 1, critical thinking and number 6, specialized discipline)

- **Critical Thinking** – Students will demonstrate critical thinking skills when evaluating situations, questions, and issues related to physical activity. (Aligns with ILO number 1, critical thinking and number 6, specialized discipline)

- **Communication Skills** – Students will be able to use appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to articulate physical activity issues in both oral and written forms. (Aligns with ILO number 2, communication skills)

- **Professionalism and Ethics** – Students will demonstrate professional dispositions--such as integrity, personal and cultural sensitivity, collaboration, and leadership--and commitment to social justice for physical activity participants. (Aligns with ILO number 3, social justice and ILO number 4, leadership)

- **Commitment to Life-Long Physical Activity** – Students will be able to articulate the importance of a commitment to life-long physical activity for all. (aligns with ILO number 6, specialized discipline)
Undergraduate Curricular Map, showing how undergraduate courses meet BOTH the undergrad SLOs and the ILOs

**Institutional Learning Outcomes**

- **Thinking and Reasoning**: All KCC
- **Communication**: All KCC except 3300, 3305, 3310
- **Diversity**: KCC 3305, 3310, 3350, 3700, 3740
- **Collaboration**: All KCC except 3340, 3700
- **Sustainability**: No KCC
- **Specialized Discipline**: All KCC

**Kinesiology Undergraduate Core Courses (KCC)**

- **Critical Thinking**: All KCC
- **Communication**: All KCC except 3300, 3305, 3310
- **Professionalism and Ethics**: KCC 3305, 3310, 3350, 3700, 3740
- **Life-Long Physical Activity**: KCC 3310, 3320, 3350, 3740
- **Professional Application**: All KCC except 3340, 3700
- **Content Knowledge**: All KCC

**Kinesiology Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes**
Graduate Program Student Learning Outcomes and Alignment with ILOs
Department of Kinesiology
California State University, East Bay
March 13, 2013

1. **Cross-Disciplinary Knowledge**: Students will demonstrate the ability to synthesize and apply perspectives from the humanities, and the social-, behavioral-, and life-sciences. (Aligns with ILO number 1, critical thinking and ILO number 6 specialized discipline)

2. **Problem Solving**: Students will be able to use disciplinary knowledge to design and implement innovative professional applications. (Aligns with ILO number 1, critical thinking and ILO number 6 specialized discipline)

3. **Critical Thinking**: Students’ thought process will be characterized by the exploration of discipline-relevant issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating a perspective. (Aligns with ILO number 1, critical thinking)

4. **Communication Skills**: Students will be able to use contextually-grounded and compelling content to articulate physical activity issues in both oral and written form. (aligns with ILO number 2, communication)

5. **Leadership**: When leading others in a kinesiology-relevant domain, students will demonstrate professional dispositions – such as integrity, personal and cultural sensitivity, and collaboration – as well as a commitment to social justice for physical activity participants. (Aligns with ILO number 3, social justice and to ILO number 4, leadership)
Graduate Curricular Map, showing how graduate courses meet both the graduate SLOs and the ILOs

**Institutional Learning Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thinking and Reasoning</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Specialized Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All KCC</td>
<td>All KCC</td>
<td>All KCC</td>
<td>All KCC</td>
<td>All KCC</td>
<td>No KCC</td>
<td>All KCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kinesiology Graduate Core Courses (KCC)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KIN 6000</th>
<th>KIN 6411</th>
<th>KIN 6435</th>
<th>KIN 6655</th>
<th>KIN 6710</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Kinesiology Graduate Student Learning Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Communication Skills</th>
<th>Problem Solving</th>
<th>Cross-Disciplinary Knowledge</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All KCC</td>
<td>All KCC except 6000, 6655</td>
<td>All KCC except 6000, 6655</td>
<td>All KCC except 6000, 6655</td>
<td>All KCC except 6000, 6655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Activities of Kinesiology Department 2013

The department of Kinesiology took several steps toward institutionalizing assessment practices this past year. We refined our undergraduate student learning outcomes (SLOs) and then mapped those to our core curriculum (see appendix). We developed graduate student learning outcomes and then mapped those to the core curriculum of our graduate program (see appendix). In both cases we also correlated our SLOs with the Institutional Learning Outcomes (see appendix).

We also assessed one of our undergraduate SLOs, critical thinking. We used the AAC&U critical thinking value rubric and applied that to an appropriate assignment from one of our core classes. We held a practice session with the faculty in which we worked through applying the rubric to student work and were able to discuss how we interpreted and used the different criteria. This conversation was quite significant in having our faculty reflect on what we consider significant to critical thinking and how that gets structured into our curriculum. We then systematically assessed student work which the details are described below. The last part of this reports addresses plans to “close the loop” or how we will use this data to improve our curriculum.

Methods

Data. The stratified sample data comprised 10 student ‘Blog’ assignments from the upper division KIN 3350 core course (“Introduction to Sport and Exercise Psychology”; Appendix A). Four assignments represented the “Pre-Physical Therapy” option, three assignments represented the “Exercise, Nutrition, and Wellness” option, two assignments represented the “Physical Education Teaching” option, and one assignment represented the “Pre-Athletic Therapy” option. This division of number of assignments among the various Kinesiology options represented the
relative percentage contribution from each Kinesiology option toward the total number of Kinesiology Seniors \((n = 137)\) identified as having met all graduation requirements in the 2012-2013 academic year.

*Measure.* The critical thinking rubric selected for this assessment was the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ (AACU) Critical Thinking Value Rubric (AACU, n.d.). The Rubric was developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the U.S., in a process involving extensive examination of existing U.S. campus rubrics and related documents for critical thinking and faculty input. The Rubric articulates fundamental factors for critical thinking (i.e., “Explanation of Issues”, “Evidence”, “Influence of Context and Assumptions”, “Student’s Position”, and, “Conclusions and Related outcomes”), and employs performance descriptors which demonstrate progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment (\(1 = \) “Under-developed” critical thinking; \(4 = \) “highly developed” critical thinking). The AACU (AACU, n.d.) notes that the Rubric is intended only for institutional-level evaluation and discussion on student learning (i.e., not for student grading purposes). The Rubric has been provided in Appendix B.

*Procedure.* In order to assess the current quality of critical thinking demonstrated among Kinesiology Majors (graduating Seniors, only) the Department SLO Assessment Committee (i.e., Beal and O) selected a signature assignment (i.e., KIN 3350 Blog assignment) to be independently rated by five tenure-track Kinesiology faculty members. Prior to independent rating of the assignments, a familiarization session was held with all Department faculty members wherein the Assessment Committee introduced the AACU scoring rubric to faculty members and facilitated a discussion of faculty members’ perceptions, concerns, and questions regarding the rubric. Prior to this session, all faculty were asked to independently score two
sample signature assignments (KIN 3350 Blog assignments) using the Rubric in order to provide a scoring-experience context upon which faculty could base their initial perceptions. The familiarization session did not conclude until all faculty members verbally expressed that he/she was comfortable with the scale employed on the rubric, with the operational definition of ‘critical thinking’ being employed, and with the scoring task, itself.

Following the familiarization session, the Departmental SLO Assessment Committee compiled the signature assignment package consisting of 10 anonymous student Blog assignments, the scoring rubric, a scoring-data spreadsheet template, and the outline of the KIN 3350 Blog assignment. The packages were delivered electronically to faculty, who were asked to electronically return their scores within a 10-day period.

**Data analysis.** Inter-rater reliability was assessed using two-way mixed, consistency, average-measures intra-class correlations (ICCs) to assess the degree of consistency among the five independent scorers’ ratings for each factor of critical thinking. Descriptive data was computed for each factor of critical thinking assessed in the Rubric (i.e., “Explanation of Issues”, “Evidence”, “Influence of Context and Assumptions”, “Student’s Position”, and, “Conclusions and Related outcomes”). Last, to explore the differences between mean scores of each of the five critical thinking factors assessed, a single-group repeated measures analysis of variance (RM-ANOVA; $p = .05$) and subsequent post hoc analyses were conducted. No independent variables were entered into the RM-ANOVA analyses (i.e., there were no groups), and each critical thinking factor was entered as a dependent variable for the analysis.
Results

**ICCs.** The resulting ICCs were all in the acceptable range ($ICC = 0.79-0.94$), indicating that raters demonstrated an acceptable degree of inter-rater reliability (e.g., Cicchetti, 1994) and consistent ratings for each of the five factors of critical thinking assessed.

**Descriptive statistics.** Descriptive statistics for each of the five critical thinking factors are provided in Table 1. Values ranged from 1.91-2.67 (out of 4), with a grand mean rating of 2.23 ($SD = 0.31$). This indicates that graduating Kinesiology Seniors at CSUEB currently demonstrate critical thinking skills that are “Minimally Developed” (based on classifications within the AACU Rubric).

**Main analysis.** Results of the single-group repeated measures ANOVA indicated that significant differences existed among mean ratings for the various factors of critical thinking ($F(1.75, 7.01) = 13.18, p = .005, \eta^2 = .96$). To explore this significant effect further, post hoc analyses were calculated for each pair of critical thinking factors (10 paired-sample t-tests; adjusted $\alpha = 0.01$). The post hoc analyses indicated that the significant main effect centered on significant differences between the mean score for critical thinking factor: “Explanation of Issues” and that of all remaining critical thinking factors (i.e., factor “Explanation of Issues” demonstrated a significantly higher mean score than each remaining factor of critical thinking assessed). Moreover, all of the remaining paired critical thinking factors failed to demonstrate statistically significant differences in mean scores ($p > 0.01$). A summary of the results of the post hoc analysis is presented in Table 2. Taken collectively, the data and subsequent analyses indicate that, based on the current sample, graduating Seniors in Kinesiology at CSUEB demonstrate significantly greater critical thinking skills relative to the “Explanation of issues”, as
compared to the other factors of critical thinking (i.e., “Evidence”, “Influence of Context and Assumptions”, “Student’s Position”, and, “Conclusions and Related outcomes”).

**Implications of results**

The Department of Kinesiology’s assessment of the critical thinking SLO indicated that graduating Kinesiology seniors at CSUEB are demonstrating minimally-developed critical thinking skills ($M = 2.23(0.31)$ out of 4.00) as independently assessed by Kinesiology faculty raters based on a stratified sample of 10 KIN 3350 Blog Assignments (the assignment is geared toward challenging students to think critically). In addition, results indicated that graduating Kinesiology seniors at CSUEB are most-skilled at explaining an issue critically (see Appendix B to review Rubric), and significantly less skilled at critically presenting evidence, taking context and assumptions into consideration, critically presenting their position, and, advancing critically-driven conclusions and related outcomes.

**Limitations**

There were a few limitations of this first round of assessing critical thinking. First, we chose an assignment that highlighted 3 of the 5 criteria (explanation, evidence and conclusion) and because the assignment had a word limit, there was not space to develop differing positions and assumptions.

The other limitation is that this is essentially a post-test without a pre-test. We don’t have evidence indicating what their skill levels were before they became majors. Relatedly, the vast majority of our students are transfer students giving us two years to develop these skills. It is important to note that level 4 (highly developed) may be aspirational, but we would be satisfied if our undergraduates could leave CSU East Bay with level 3 (adequately developed). Nonetheless, this information can inform our educational practices.
Closing the loop

Our department has a fall faculty retreat. We will be discussing the results of our assessment and how those can impact our curriculum and teaching practices. We have already agreed that we need to create a standardized signature assignment (but with flexibility for specific options) that would serve as our main evidence to assess all our SLOs. With regard to teaching, we will use the rubric as a guideline to discuss what faculty currently do to focus on/teach CT skills. We will also discuss our perceptions on the effectiveness of the current CT teaching methods identified and generate a pool of pedagogical resources that faculty can use in their classrooms. This heightened intentionality to teaching critical thinking can allow for common reference across classes so that students’ awareness and practice of critical thinking can be enhanced.
Table 1.

*Descriptive statistics for signature assignment scores of graduating CSUEB Kinesiology Seniors (N = 10).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking Factor</th>
<th>ICC</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Explanation of Issues</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Evidence</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Influence of Context and Assumptions</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Student’s Position</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Conclusions and Related Outcomes</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Mean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ICC = Intra-class correlations (consistency in ratings between faculty raters); SD = standard deviation
Table 2.

*Post hoc (paired sample t-tests) results comparing the mean difference between each respective pair of critical thinking factors.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-test pair</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTA - CTB</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA - CTC</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA - CTD</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA - CTE</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTB - CTC</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTB - CTD</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTB - CTE</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC - CTD</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC - CTE</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTD - CTE</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Adjusted α = 0.01; M = Mean difference between factor pair; CTA = “Explanation of Issues” factor, CTB = “Evidence” factor; CTC = “Influence of Context and Assumptions” factor, CTD = “Student’s Position” factor, CTE = “Conclusions and Related Outcomes” factor; * = Statistically significant difference.
APPENDIX A

KIN 3350 BLOG ASSIGNMENT OUTLINE
BLACKBOARD BLOGS INDIVIDUAL ASSIGNMENT

Introduction

Linking theory to practice is a key theme in many courses within the KIN program at CSU East Bay, and is one of the major themes of this course. In this assignment, you will examine how sport and exercise psychology is represented in popular culture by exploring how it is depicted in films, news stories, books, blogs, and other sources of popular culture. In this assignment, you will be responsible for collecting popular culture sources and evaluating the accuracy and strength of the link between theory and practice in each of your chosen sources.

Every other week (bi-weekly; first blog due Thursday April 11) you are required to find a pop culture source that demonstrates one of the psychological concepts covered in lecture or lab within the last two weeks. For example, for Blog #1 that is due on April 11th, the topics you can choose from to find a source to blog about are: personality in sport or exercise, motivation in sport or exercise, or, character development and good sporting behavior. For Blog #2 that is due April 25th, possible source topics are: Arousal, stress, and arousal, arousal regulation, competition and cooperation, or, group dynamics.

The pop culture source must be framed within the context of sport or physical activity. For example, you may select a movie where specific team building strategies are used to improve team cohesion, a magazine article describing how to use imagery to help an athlete cope with competitive anxiety, or a cartoon where self-talk is used to increase an exerciser’s confidence about sticking to an exercise program (these are just examples, there are lots of other possibilities). The sources of your choice must clearly relate to the psychological concept in sufficient detail that you can evaluate the accuracy with which the concept is represented.

Blog Content

Over the course of the quarter, you will gather pop culture examples that relate to the course content (e.g., news stories, magazine articles, comics, movies, books, memes, YouTube videos, etc.). For five of your pop culture sources (one due every-other week), you will create a blog entry critiquing how well that source reflects the theory and research in the field of sport and exercise psychology that is related to that topic.

Specifically, for each blog, I will be looking for you to (and, thus, grading):

1. Create a new blog post on Blackboard that clearly identifies the topic of the post (i.e., the name of the concept or theory in the title). PLEASE DO NOT ATTACH A WORD FILE.: Type your text directly into the blog space so that it is easier for your peers to access your blog content. If it’s easier, feel free to copy-and-paste from a word document into the blog text space (just check text formatting afterwards).

2. Provide a brief summary of the pop culture source you selected, in your own words (approximately 3 sentences). You should include the original pop culture source
(e.g., as a JPEG, link to the URL of the magazine article, news story, YouTube video, etc.).

- Make sure you include the **full reference information** for the source in APA (6th edition) format and the **context** (e.g., ad campaign, joke, opinion piece or blog, news story, etc.) in which it was presented.

3. **Identify and describe the specific psychological concept** your pop culture source represents (2-3 sentences). Note that by “specific”, I mean you should be identifying and describing a particular concept you’ve learned about, not just the general topic covered in the lecture or lab (e.g., Instead of the general topics of ‘motivation’ or ‘personality’, you should instead pick a more specific concept covered within lecture or lab, such as: achievement motivation, neuroticism, task goal-orientation, ‘playing-to-not-lose’, etc.).

- Make sure that you demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of the concept, using the appropriate terminology from the course (paraphrase, DO NOT use word-for-word quotes from the textbook or other sources). Any time you provide information that is not your own idea (e.g., definitions, references to theories, etc.), make sure that you reference the original source appropriately (e.g., using APA formatting).

4. State whether (or not) you believe the psychological concept was accurately represented in the pop culture source, based on what you have learned in this course. This section should address the following questions:
   i. Was the psychological concept portrayed in a way that is consistent with theory and research, and more importantly, why or why not (substantiate this with textbook information and at least one other academic reference)?
   ii. Do you think the pop culture source presents the topic in a positive, negative, or neutral way? Why do you think this?
   iii. How do you think the presentation of this topic in this way might affect what people think about, or how they might (or might not) use the particular topic in their own lives? Why do you think this (substantiate this with at least one academic reference)?

5. **Support your analysis with at least two academic sources.** You can use the course textbook as one source, but the other source(s) must be a research article published in a peer-reviewed scientific journal. The academic sources should be used to justify the points made in your analysis and convince me that your arguments are valid (i.e., don’t just use your references for definitions…this will not earn you any points for using a reference). You may include more than 2 references for each topic, if you like.

**Formatting Guidelines**

1. Reference information within each blog post must conform to American Psychological Association (APA) style guidelines (6th edition). I find the easiest way to ensure this is to type up the blog in a Word document and then copy-and-paste it into the blog text space. With regard to APA formatting, I will specifically be looking for:
   - Double-spaced text.
- Sources cited within the text using APA 6th edition guidelines.
- References section included at the end of the blog post, containing all sources cited, including your popular culture source.
- You do not need to include a title page, abstract, or page numbers in your blog posts.

2. All statements that are not your original ideas (e.g., statistics, information taken from the textbook, internet, journal articles, lecture notes, etc.) must be followed by a citation indicating the original source. The sources cited within the text of your blog post should also be included in a reference list at the end of your post.

**Evaluation**

Blogs will be assessed according to content, completeness, APA format, and writing style (see rubric on Blackboard).
APPENDIX B

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC (AACU, n.d.)
Critical Thinking Value Rubric
(Association of American Colleges and Universities; AACU, n.d.)

- Developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the US
- Process involved examination of existing campus rubrics and related documents for critical thinking and faculty input
- Rubric articulates fundamental criteria for critical thinking
- Performance descriptors demonstrate progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment
- Intended for institutional-level evaluation and discussion on student learning

Critical thinking:

“[A] habit mind characterizes by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion of conclusion (AACU, n.d.)."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Highly developed (4)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Adequately developed (3)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Minimally developed (2)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Under developed (1)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation of issues</strong></td>
<td>Issue to be considered stated clearly and described comprehensively. All information relevant to full understanding of the issue of the issue is delivered.</td>
<td>Issue to be considered is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.</td>
<td>Issue to be considered is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, and boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong></td>
<td>Information is taken from sources with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis of synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.</td>
<td>Information is taken from sources with interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influence of context and assumptions</strong></td>
<td>Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others’ assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td>Identifies own and others’ assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td>Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others’ assumptions than one’s own (or vice versa).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student’s position (perspective, thesis, hypothesis)</strong></td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis, and hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position are acknowledged. Others’ points of view are synthesized within position.</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis, and hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others’ points of view are acknowledged within position.</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis, and hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and Consequences)</strong></td>
<td>Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student’s informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.</td>
<td>Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.</td>
<td>Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>