

HWA CHONG INSTITUTION (HIGH SCHOOL) PROJECTS COMPETITION 2012
 CATEGORY 2: Non-Experimental (**PURE**) Research Judging Form for FINALS ROUND (Upper Sec/Lower Sec)

ORAL PRESENTATION	1	2	3	4
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. Does not engage the audience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Somewhat enthusiastic, confident, and expressive. Maintains eye contact most of the time but frequently reads off notes/slides. Audience remains somewhat engaged. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fairly enthusiastic, confident, and expressive. Maintains eye contact with audience, well-prepared, occasional reference to notes. Audience remains engaged. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enthusiastic, confident, and expressive. Maintains eye contact with audience, captivating, excellent presentation. Audience remains engaged and are compelled to participate in the subsequent Q&A..
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.
RESEARCH DESIGN	1	2	3	4
RESEARCH PROPOSAL AND OBJECTIVES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research objectives are clear. Some objectives are met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research objectives are clear. 70 % of the objectives are met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research objectives are clear. 80% of the objectives are met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research objectives are clear. 90% of the objectives are met.
LITERATURE REVIEW (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.
APPROACH FOR THE RESEARCH	<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
DATA ANALYSIS	1	2	3	4
SOURCES (Range & Reliability)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The review of literature consisted of non-research based articles. Few or no sources consulted (mainly non-academic, online sources) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some attempt to consult several sources (<10). Some selected literature was from unreliable sources. There is limited variety in the sources consulted (mainly non-academic sources) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ample sources consulted (10-14) The literature was largely based on reliable sources. Peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature are cited A reasonable variety in the sources is seen (academic, print and non-print, online) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive sources consulted (15-20) The literature was based on reliable sources. Peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature are cited A significant variety of sources are consulted (academic, print and non-print, online)
ACCURACY AND RELEVANCE (X2)	<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 support the literature review/project.

CRITIQUE OF LITERATURE (1) (Limitations/Assumptions)	Limitations and assumptions are omitted.	Important limitations and assumptions have not been identified.	Some limitations and assumptions have been identified.	Appropriate and important limitations and assumptions have been clearly stated.
CRITIQUE OF LITERATURE (2) (Analysis/Synthesis)	The analysis or synthesis is severely lacking.	Some attempt is made to analyse or synthesize the information.	Ample attempt to analyse or synthesize the information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The analysis or synthesis is highly evident. The analysis or synthesis is succinct and precise.
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION (X2)	<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.
DATA EVIDENCE (X2) (ACCURACY, CLARITY)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biased, unsubstantiated opinions No graphs/tables/primary sources/statistical tables/transcripts of interviews/surveys/ to show proof of data analysis (vague and opaque) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marginally substantiated, with shades of bias Few graphs/tables/primary sources/statistical tables/transcripts of interviews/surveys/ to show proof of data analysis (lacking in clarity and transparency – with clear omissions of data). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate substantiation, fair perspective Almost all the graphs/tables/primary sources/statistical tables/transcripts of interviews/surveys/are used to show proof of data analysis (somewhat clear and transparent with 1 or 2 oversights). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well substantiated and mature perspective Graphs/tables/primary sources/statistical tables/transcripts of interviews/surveys/ are well presented as proof of data analysis (very clear and transparent presentation)

OTHERS	1	2	3	4
ORGANISATION & PRESENTATION	Overall presentation does not pay very close attention to the formality of proper layout, citation and bibliography. Haphazard and lacking in referencing.	Overall presentation pays reasonably close attention to the formality of proper layout. Some glaring errors in the referencing process.	Overall presentation pays strict attention to the formality of proper layout. Some minor inaccuracies in referencing and citation.	Overall presentation is equivalent to that of a formal research report in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Excellent and adequate referencing.
LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE IN WRITING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive errors in language and expression Hardly developed and lacking in a personal style Serious grammar and spelling errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear errors in language and expression Weak development but trying to develop a personal style Weak grammar with inaccuracies in spelling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate and accurate language and expression (some minor inadequacies in tone and register) Adequate academic register. More of a synthesis rather than a formal academic style Apt grammar and correct spelling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sophisticated language and expression (formal academic tone and register) Well developed and clear personal style Accurate grammar and spelling

Only groups scoring at least 55 will be considered for Grand Finals Selection round.

Judge's name : _____ Signature : _____

Marks : _____/64

Group recommended for Grand Finals selection round? *Yes/No (please circle)

If "Yes", please state reason(s). Also include areas for improvements.