SPED4103 spring semester 2025
Home Exam

SPED4103 – Evidence-Based Practice in Educational Audiology

Vår 2025

Disclosure of exam assignment: May 26 at 9:00 AM

Submission deadline: May 28 at 2:00 PM

Objective

The purpose of this assignment is to critically analyze and compare two peer-reviewed research articles related to educational audiology (= audiopedagogikk), with a specific focus on evidence-based practice. Students are expected to demonstrate their understanding of evidence-based practice, research methodologies, and the application of findings to real-world educational audiology settings.

Assignment

Write a comprehensive comparative analysis of the two articles. Your paper should include the following sections: Introduction, Summary of each article, Comparison, (Use of AI statement), Reference list.

1. Introduction:

- Briefly introduce the topic and its relevance to educational audiology.

2. Summary of each article:

- Present a summary of the key findings, methods, and conclusions of Article A.
- Present a summary of the key findings, methods, and conclusions of Article B.

3. Comparison:

- Compare the research methods (what has been done and how) used in each article. Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each methodology.
- Analyze the results and conclusions of each study. Does one article provide stronger evidence than the other? Why?
- Discuss the implications of the findings for evidence-based practice in educational audiology. How can practitioners apply the results of each study in their work?

Use of AI statement

If applicable, explain shortly how you have used AI in this assignment. This heading should come after the main text (points 1–3 above), but before the reference list. If you have not used AI, you do not have to include this heading. Please also see *Use of AI* further down.

Reference list

SPED4103 spring semester 2025
Home Exam

Formatting and submission

- Your paper should be 3000 (± 500) words in length. Reference lists are not included in the word count. Any tables or figures that you may wish to use do not count towards the word limit.
- Use Times New Roman, font size 12 pts, line space 1.5.
- Write references in accordance with the APA 7th standard.
- Ensure that all sources are properly cited in the text and that they are included in your reference list at the end of the document. You may consult additional scholarly resources, textbooks, or online databases to support your analysis.
- Submission is made in Inspera. The file formats allowed are .pdf, .doc., .docx, and .zip.

Grading

Grading scale

Grades are awarded on a scale from A to F, where A is the best grade and F is a fail.

Specific grading criteria

Below, the assignment-specific criteria for grades A, C, E, and F are described. The grades B and D are awarded for papers that are assessed to be between grades A and C, and C and E, respectively.

A (Excellent): The student demonstrates an exceptional understanding of the research articles and their implications for evidence-based practice in educational audiology. They provide a comprehensive, insightful, and nuanced comparative analysis that critically evaluates methodologies, findings, and implications. The paper is exceptionally well-organized, with a logical flow of ideas and clearly articulated arguments. Adheres strictly to APA formatting.

C (Good): The student demonstrates a competent understanding of the research articles and their implications for practice. They offer a satisfactory comparative analysis, but may lack depth in some areas of methodology or implications. The organization is clear, but some sections may lack coherence or clarity. Mostly adheres to APA formatting.

E (Sufficient): The student provides a basic summary of the articles but lacks depth and critical engagement with the content. They provide a superficial comparative analysis that does not adequately address methodologies or implications for practice. The structure is disorganized or unclear in a way that makes it difficult to follow the arguments. Poor adherence to APA formatting.

F (Fail): The student does not demonstrate a basic understanding of the research articles, and significant inaccuracies are present. The paper lacks meaningful

comparative analysis and the student fails to engage with the texts. The text is poorly organized with little to no logical flow of ideas. Does not adhere to APA formatting.

General grading criteria

A – Excellent: An excellent performance, clearly outstanding. The candidate demonstrates excellent judgement and a high degree of independent thinking.

B – Very good: A very good performance. The candidate demonstrates sound judgement and a very good degree of independent thinking.

C – Good: A good performance in most areas. The candidate demonstrates a reasonable degree of judgement and independent thinking in the most important areas.

D – Satisfactory: A satisfactory performance, but with significant shortcomings. The candidate demonstrates a limited degree of judgement and independent thinking.

E – Sufficient: A performance that meets the minimum criteria, but no more. The candidate demonstrates a very limited degree of judgement and independent thinking.

F – Fail: A performance that does not meet the minimum academic criteria. The candidate demonstrates an absence of both judgement and independent thinking.

Use of AI

Make sure that you are familiar with the guidelines for using AI as a student available on the UiO web pages (https://www.uio.no/english/studies/resources/ai_student.html). These include, but are not limited to:

- Use AI **as a support**, not as a replacement for your own work.
- Clearly indicate **when and how** you have utilised AI.
- AI can be a supplement for understanding topics, curriculum, and terminology, but always **verify the information** against reliable sources.
- **Avoid sharing sensitive information and copyrighted material** in AI tools without approval.
- You may use AI tools to support your learning. However, your submissions should reflect your own knowledge and interpretation. Use AI tools for inspiration only, not to produce your actual submission.