

HWA CHONG INSTITUTION (HIGH SCHOOL) PROJECTS COMPETITION 2014
CATEGORY 2: Non-Experimental (PURE) Research Judging Form for SEMI FINAL ROUND (Upper Sec/Lower Sec)

ORAL PRESENTATION	1	2	3	4
NUMBER OF PRESENTERS	Uneven involvement (ONLY 1 dominant presenter)	Uneven involvement	Uneven involvement – but acceptable contribution levels from all members	All presenters equally involved
DELIVERY/EYE CONTACT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mumbles or appears uninterested, Lacks confidence and expression. Occasionally maintains eye contact, but mostly reads off a script. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Somewhat enthusiastic, confident, and expressive. Maintains eye contact most of the time but frequently reads off notes/slides. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fairly enthusiastic, confident, and expressive. Maintains eye contact with audience, well-prepared, occasional reference to notes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enthusiastic, confident, and expressive. Maintains eye contact with audience, captivating, excellent presentation.
ORGANISATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content is confusing. Illogical flow of ideas/theories/ concepts. Difficult to follow/Incomprehensible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Content is organised. The Audience is able to understand some of the ideas/theories/concepts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Content is well organised. The Audience is able to follow and understand most of the ideas/theories/concepts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Content is well organised. Logical flow of ideas. Ideas/ theories/concepts are clearly conveyed.
QUESTION & ANSWER	Unable to respond convincingly to any of the questions.	Can answer some questions thus reflecting some grasp of research content/direction.	Can answer most questions, thus reflecting an adequate grasp of research content/direction.	Can answer all questions convincingly thus reflecting an in-depth grasp of research content/direction.
LITERATURE REVIEW	1	2	3	4
TREATMENT OF LITERATURE	Mere description of previous research in the field of study, with no evaluation. No linkage between the literature and the current project.	Some expansion and elaboration of previous research in the field of study. Lacking in a clear linkage between the literature and the current project.	Ample evaluation and elaboration of previous research in the field of study, with an attempted positioning of current study in the wider literature	Strong, justified critique of previous research, with explicit positioning of current study in the wider literature
COMMAND OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW PROCESS (Examines the Linkage between Thesis Statement, Research Question & choice of Literature)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflects researcher's minimal command of the literature review process. The research literature is not linked to the thesis statement/research questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflects researcher's satisfactory command of the literature review process The connection between the literature and the thesis statement/research questions can be made clearer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflects researcher's sound command of the literature review process Most of the research literature and the thesis statement/ research questions are connected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflects researcher's exceptional command of the literature review process The research literature and thesis statement/research questions are closely aligned.
RANGE OF PERSPECTIVES	Minimal attempt to consult different perspectives. Analysis comes from a purely personal perspective that lacks academic rigour.	Some attempt to consult different perspectives. Analysis lacks depth, clarity and justification.	Good attempt at consulting different perspectives. In-depth analysis of at least 1 academic perspective.	Clear, strong attempt at consulting different perspectives. More than 2 academic perspectives analysed.
METHODOLOGY	1	2	3	4
RESEARCH APPROACH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research approach is inappropriate or has not been identified/described using standard academic terminology. The research approach adopted fails to answer the research question(s). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research approach is confusing or inadequate given the research questions. The research approach adopted does not adequately answer research question(s). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research approach has been identified and described in sufficient detail – with standard academic terminology. The research method adopted answers research question (s) quite well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research approach is coherent with a recognised academic methodology. The research approach answers research question(s) convincingly
CONTEXTUALISING SOURCES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources are not placed in context. Sources cited are insignificant, tangential and inappropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the sources are placed in the current context of the project. Some of the sources cited are not well selected and do not contribute adequately to the discussion raised in the literature review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of the sources are placed in the current context of the project. Sources are appropriate and well aligned to support discussion raised in literature review/project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of the sources are placed in the current context of the project. Sources are significant and relevant to the support the literature review/project.

SCOPE	Limited scope AND/OR over-generalization.	Sufficient scope AND/OR with room for expansion.	Balanced scope and objectives.	Scope of study is appropriate with the purpose of this study
PROCEDURES	Procedures for gathering data were omitted.	Procedures (permissions, treatments, and gathering of sources) were confusing, incomplete, or lacked relevance to purpose, research questions, or sampling strategy.	Procedures for implementing the study (permissions, treatments, and gathering of sources) were identified and described in a clear, logical fashion.	Procedures were thorough, manageable, coherent, and powerful for generating valid and reliable data. Clear and reasonable strategies were presented for seeking permissions and for the ethical treatment of human subjects (where applicable).
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No insight • Lacks depth in discussion • Analyses only some of the basic points (lacking in analysis and synthesis). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainly states the obvious - limited insight • Some depth in discussion • Analyses only the most basic points – Fails analyse and synthesise information accordingly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate/Interesting insights • Good depth in discussion • Some important points are missing in the discussion • Synthesizes information from the results to support the hypothesis / thesis statement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent insights • Excellent depth • Results and discussion well focused, relevant, repeatable. • Excellent evidence of analysis and synthesis.
REFERENCING	No referencing protocols used. Eg. website address only	Attempts to adhere to standard referencing protocols (e.g. APA) – with some glaring errors	Adherence to standard referencing protocols (e.g. APA) – with some minor errors.	Adherence to standard referencing protocols (e.g. APA).

At least 31 points (out of 52) = Advance to Finals

Suggestions for improvements:

Judge's name : _____

Signature : _____

Marks : _____/52