

HWA CHONG INSTITUTION (HIGH SCHOOL) PROJECTS COMPETITION 2014
CATEGORY 2: Non-Experimental Research Prelim Judging Form (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, lack 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.
Q&A	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 PROCESS	1	2	3	4
PURPOSE OF STUDY <i>Note: Pure Research vs. Applied Research</i>	Irrelevant, unidentified, unclear	Unclear, lacking in a clear rationale.	Identified and stated with some explanation.	Clearly identified, stated and explained with a clear rationale
RESEARCH PROBLEM/ STATEMENT	Framing of questions/thesis statement is vague, conceptually/theoretically inaccurate & conflicting,	Some conceptual/theoretical inaccuracies, at disjunction with thesis statement	Well-defined and relevant research questions that frame the thesis statement	Excellent, lucidly framed research questions/thesis statement
RESEARCH IDEAS	Research idea serves its purposes to a limited extent	Research serves its purposes to some extent	Research serves its purpose to a large extent	Research serves its purposes very well
POTENTIAL FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT	There is no potential	Has limited potential even with amendments	Has potential with some amendments	High potential
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
FEASIBILITY OF DATA COLLECTION IN STUDY	Most data are badly -defined or not collectable.	Some KEY data are badly-defined or not collectable.	Most of the required data are well-defined and can be collected and analysed.	All required data are well-defined and can be collected and analysed.
METHODOLOGY/ PROJECT PLAN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few or no methods are referenced with no general strategy for investigation. Specific methods are poorly described. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacking in the use of a theoretical concept. General strategy with few details and limited methods to investigate the research topic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research hinged on at least one recognised theoretical concept. A reasonable description with general details of the strategy used is present. Some evidence of cost-benefit analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than one theoretical concept is used. Good delineation of the time-line/ general strategy. Cost-benefit analysis completed.
LITERATURE REVIEW	Little or minimal lit review. Critique is superficial and of face value. No link between literature review and research direction. Uses only non-academic online sources.	Lacking in reference to landmark texts and in-depth interpretation. Little link between literature review and research direction. Uses mainly non-academic online sources.	Sound research and lit review process with some reference to landmark texts. Reflects sensitivity in interpretation and some efforts at in-depth interpretation. A good variety of sources were used (academic, print and non-print, online).	Sound research and lit review process – with reference to landmark texts. In-depth interpretation that contextualizes research within literature review. A wide variety of sources were used (academic, print and non-print, online)
REFERENCING	No referencing protocols used. Eg. website address only	Attempts to adhere to standard referencing protocols (e.g. APA) – with	Adherence to standard referencing protocols (e.g. APA) – with some minor	Adherence to standard referencing protocols (e.g. APA).

HWA CHONG INSTITUTION (HIGH SCHOOL) PROJECTS COMPETITION 2014
CATEGORY 2: Non-Experimental Research Prelim Judging Form (Upper Sec/Lower Sec)

		some glaring errors	errors.	
--	--	---------------------	---------	--

At least 20 points = Advance to Semi-finals

Suggestions for improvements:

Judge's name : _____

Signature : _____

Marks : ____/52