**Due Date:** Nov 15, 2016 23:59:59       **Max Points:** 100  
  
**Details:**

As you move forward in your doctoral journey, you will read research papers that will require you to assess the validity of the studies in question. To accomplish this, qualitative assessments about the research must be made by comparing, contrasting, and synthesizing what the research says. In this assignment, you will begin to develop this skill by comparing the three research studies from your Comparison Matrix assignment.  
  
***General Guidelines:***

Use the following information to ensure successful completion of the assignment:

* This assignment uses a rubric. Please review the rubric prior to beginning the assignment to become familiar with the expectations for successful completion.  
  Doctoral learners are required to use APA style for their writing assignments.
* The APA Style Guide is located in the Student Success Center.  
  You are required to submit this assignment to Turnitin. Refer to the directions in the Student Success Center.
* Locate and print the completed Comparison Matrix Assignment you submitted in Topic 3.

***Directions:***

Using the information from the completed Comparison Matrix, write an essay of 750-1,000 words. In your essay, compare the three studies. Include the information from Article 1 in your comparison. The paper should include the following sections:

1. Introduction.
2. Comparison of the research questions posed for the studies.
3. Comparison of the sample populations used.
4. Comparison of the limitations of the study.
5. Conclusion.
6. Recommendations for further research.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Format** | |  | | | | | | | |
| **5.0 %** **APA Format (Use of appropriate style for the major and assignment)** | | Format is not used appropriately or documentation format is rarely followed correctly. | Appropriate format is used, but some elements are missing or mistaken. A lack of control with formatting is apparent. | Appropriate format is used. Formatting is correct, although some minor errors may be present. | Appropriate format is fully used. There are virtually no errors in formatting style. | All format elements are correct. | | |  |
| **5.0 %** **Research Citations (In-text citations for paraphrasing and direct quotes, and reference page listing and formatting, as appropriate to assignment and style)** | | No reference page is included. No citations are used. | Reference page is present. Citations are inconsistently used. | Reference page is included and lists sources used in the paper. Sources are appropriately documented, although some errors may be present. | Reference page is present and fully inclusive of all cited sources. Documentation is appropriate and citation style is usually correct. | In-text citations and a reference page are complete and correct. The documentation of cited sources is free of error. | | |  |
| **100 %** **Total Weightage** | |  | | | | | | |  |
| Top of Form   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Unsatisfactory 0.00%** | **2 Less Than Satisfactory 74.00%** | **3 Satisfactory 79.00%** | **4 Good 87.00%** | **5 Excellent 100.00%** | | **70.0 %Content** |  | | | | | | | **10.0 %** **Introduction** | An introduction is not present. | An introduction is present, but it does not relate to the body of the paper. | An introduction is present, and it relates to the body of the paper. There is nothing in the introduction to entice the reader to continue reading. | An introduction is present, and it relates to the body of the paper. Information presented in the introduction provides a weak incentive for the reader to continue reading. | An introduction is present, and it relates to the body of the paper. Information presented in the introduction is intriguing and encourages the reader to continue reading. |  | | **15.0 %** **Comparison of Research Questions** | No comparison of research questions is presented. | A comparison of research questions is presented. However, the comparison is not valid. | A cursory though valid comparison of research questions is presented. | A moderately thorough and valid comparison of research questions is presented. | A reflective and insightful comparison of research questions is presented. |  | | **15.0 %** **Comparison of Sample Populations** | No comparison of sample populations is presented. | A comparison of sample populations is presented. However, the comparison is not valid. | A cursory though valid comparison of sample populations is presented. | A moderately thorough and valid comparison of sample populations is presented. | A reflective and insightful comparison of sample populations is presented. |  | | **15.0 %** **Comparison of the limitations of the study** | No comparison of the limitations of the study is presented. | A comparison of the limitations of the study is presented. However, the comparison is not valid. | A cursory though valid comparison of the limitations of the study is presented. | A moderately thorough and valid comparison of the limitations of the study is presented. | A reflective and insightful comparison of the limitations of the study is presented. |  | | **8.0 %** **Conclusion** | No conclusion is presented. | A conclusion is presented. However, is is incomplete or otherwise lacking in substance. | A fundamental and basic conclusion is presented. | A moderately thorough conclusion is presented. | A reflective and insightful conclusion research is presented. |  | | **7.0 %** **Recommendations for Further Research** | No recommendations for further research are presented. | Recommendations for further research are presented. However, they are incomplete or otherwise not valid. | Cursory though valid recommendations for further research are presented. | Moderately thorough and valid recommendations for further research are presented. | Reflective and insightful recommendations for further research are presented. |  | | **20.0 %Organization and Effectiveness** |  | | | | | | | **7.0 %** **Thesis Development and Purpose** | Paper lacks any discernible overall purpose or organizing claim. | Thesis and/or main claim are insufficiently developed and/or vague; purpose is not clear. | Thesis and/or main claim are apparent and appropriate to purpose. | Thesis and/or main claim are clear and forecast the development of the paper. It is descriptive and reflective of the arguments and appropriate to the purpose. | Thesis and/or main claim are comprehensive. The essence of the paper is contained within the thesis. Thesis statement makes the purpose of the paper clear. |  | | **8.0 %** **Argument Logic and Construction** | Statement of purpose is not justified by the conclusion. The conclusion does not support the claim made. Argument is incoherent and uses noncredible sources. | Sufficient justification of claims is lacking. Argument lacks consistent unity. There are obvious flaws in the logic. Some sources have questionable credibility. | Argument is orderly, but may have a few inconsistencies. The argument presents minimal justification of claims. Argument logically, but not thoroughly, supports the purpose. Sources used are credible. Introduction and conclusion bracket the thesis. | Argument shows logical progressions. Techniques of argumentation are evident. There is a smooth progression of claims from introduction to conclusion. Most sources are authoritative. | Clear and convincing argument that presents a persuasive claim in a distinctive and compelling manner. All sources are authoritative. |  | | **5.0 %** **Mechanics of Writing (includes spelling, punctuation, grammar, language use)** | Surface errors are pervasive enough that they impede communication of meaning. Inappropriate word choice and/or sentence construction are used. | Frequent and repetitive mechanical errors distract the reader. Inconsistencies in language choice (register), sentence structure, and/or word choice are present. | Some mechanical errors or typos are present, but are not overly distracting to the reader. Correct sentence structure and audience-appropriate language are used. | Prose is largely free of mechanical errors, although a few may be present. A variety of sentence structures and effective figures of speech are used. | Writer is clearly in command of standard, written, academic English. |  | | **10.0 %Format** |  | | | | | | | **5.0 %** **APA Format (Use of appropriate style for the major and assignment)** | Format is not used appropriately or documentation format is rarely followed correctly. | Appropriate format is used, but some elements are missing or mistaken. A lack of control with formatting is apparent. | Appropriate format is used. Formatting is correct, although some minor errors may be present. | Appropriate format is fully used. There are virtually no errors in formatting style. | All format elements are correct. |  | | **5.0 %** **Research Citations (In-text citations for paraphrasing and direct quotes, and reference page listing and formatting, as appropriate to assignment and style)** | No reference page is included. No citations are used. | Reference page is present. Citations are inconsistently used. | Reference page is included and lists sources used in the paper. Sources are appropriately documented, although some errors may be present. | Reference page is present and fully inclusive of all cited sources. Documentation is appropriate and citation style is usually correct. | In-text citations and a reference page are complete and correct. The documentation of cited sources is free of error. |  | | **100 %** **Total Weightage** |  | | | | |  |   Bottom of Form | | | | | |  |
|  | | | | | |  |  |

**Comparison Matrix**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Article 1 | Article 2 | Article 3 |
| Title/Author(s) | *Relationships Among Structural*  *Empowerment, Psychological Empowerment,*  *And Burnout in Registered Staff Nurses*  *Working in Outpatient Dialysis Centers*  O’Brien | *Analyzing Student Complaints Against Nursing Programs: Taxonomies of Complaints and Outcomes*  Wolf & Czekanski |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Persistent GCU Library Link | <https://lopes.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cmedm&AN=22338940&site=eds-live&scope=site> | <http://dx.doi.org.lopes.idm.oclc.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2011.06.004> |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Purpose of the Study**  What is the author’s rationale for selecting this topic? Does he build a strong case? | To offer an overview of the relationships between burnout in registered staff nurses working in outpatient hemodialysis settings, psychological empowerment, and structural empowerment.  The author uses data gathered from 500 registered nurses measuring burnout using the Emotional Exhaustion Subscale (EES) of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. The Conditions of Work Effectiveness Questionnaire (CWEQ-II) was used to measure the structural empowerment element and psychological empowerment was measured using Spreitzer’s Psychological Empowerment Instrument. Using correlational analysis it was determined that all dimensions were related, significantly, to burnout. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Research Question(s)**  What question(s) does the author present? | This study looked at the following hypotheses:   * There is an inverse relationship   between structural empowerment and burnout.   * There is an inverse relationship   between psychological empowerment and burnout.   * There is a positive relationship   between structural empowerment and psychological empowerment.   * Psychological empowerment mediates the relationship between structural empowerment and burnout. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Sample Population(s)**  What group(s) is/are being studied? | 500 registered nurses working in outpatient hemodialysis centers in the U.S. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Limitations**  What are the limitations of the study? Why can it only encompass so much? | One limitation might be that the average age of the respondents was 49.6 years.  Others include:   * Mostly Caucasian * Mostly full-time * Nurses came only from a professional organization * Years of experience * Methodology used   Since the study only took into account the perceptions of nurses, the study did not look into how nursing management saw the concept of burnout played out in their nurses. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |