

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

ORAL PRESENTATION	1	2	3	4
<b>NUMBER OF PRESENTERS</b>	Uneven involvement (ONLY 1 dominant presenter)	Uneven involvement	Uneven involvement – but acceptable contribution levels from all members	All presenters equally involved
<b>DELIVERY/EYE CONTACT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mumbles or appears uninterested,</li> <li>Lacks confidence and expression.</li> <li>Occasionally maintains eye contact, but mostly reads off a script.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Somewhat enthusiastic, confident, and expressive.</li> <li>Maintains eye contact most of the time but frequently reads off notes/slides.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fairly enthusiastic, confident, and expressive.</li> <li>Maintains eye contact with audience, well-prepared, occasional reference to notes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enthusiastic, confident, and expressive.</li> <li>Maintains eye contact with audience, captivating, excellent presentation.</li> </ul>
<b>ORGANISATION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content is confusing.</li> <li>Illogical flow of ideas/theories/concepts.</li> <li>Difficult to follow/Incomprehensible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Content is organised.</li> <li>The Audience is able to understand some of the ideas/theories/concepts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Content is well organised.</li> <li>The Audience is able to follow and understand most of the ideas/theories/concepts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Content is well organised.</li> <li>Logical flow of ideas.</li> <li>Ideas/ theories/concepts are clearly conveyed.</li> </ul>
<b>QUESTION &amp; ANSWER</b>	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
<b>TREATMENT OF LITERATURE</b>	Mere <b>description</b> of previous research in the field of study, with no evaluation. No linkage between the literature and the current project.	Some <b>expansion</b> and <b>elaboration</b> of previous research in the field of study. Lacking in a clear linkage between the literature and the current project.	Ample <b>evaluation</b> and <b>elaboration</b> of previous research in the field of study, with an attempted positioning of current study in the wider literature	<b>Strong, justified critique</b> of previous research, with explicit positioning of current study in the wider literature
<b>COMMAND OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW PROCESS (Examines the Linkage between Thesis Statement, Research Question &amp; choice of Literature)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflects researcher's <b>minimal</b> command of the literature review process.</li> <li>The research literature is not linked to the thesis statement/research questions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflects researcher's <b>satisfactory</b> command of the literature review process</li> <li>The connection between the literature and the thesis statement/research questions can be made clearer.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflects researcher's <b>sound</b> command of the literature review process</li> <li>Most of the research literature and the thesis statement/ research questions are connected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflects researcher's <b>exceptional</b> command of the literature review process</li> <li>The research literature and thesis statement/research questions are closely aligned.</li> </ul>
<b>RANGE OF PERSPECTIVES</b>	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.
<b>CRITIQUE OF LITERATURE (1) (Limitations/Assumptions)</b>	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.
<b>CRITIQUE OF LITERATURE (2) (Analysis/Synthesis)</b>	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"> <li>The analysis or synthesis is highly evident.</li> <li>The analysis or synthesis is succinct and precise.</li> </ul>
METHODOLOGY	1	2	3	4
<b>RESEARCH APPROACH</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research approach is inappropriate or has not been identified/described using standard academic terminology.</li> <li>The research approach adopted fails to answer the research question(s).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research approach is confusing or inadequate given the research questions.</li> <li>The research approach adopted does not adequately answer research question(s).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research approach has been identified and described in sufficient detail – with standard academic terminology.</li> <li>The research method adopted answers research question (s) quite well.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research approach is coherent with a recognised academic methodology.</li> <li>The research approach answers research question(s) convincingly</li> </ul>

<b>CONTEXTUALISING SOURCES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources are not placed in context.</li> <li>Sources cited are <b>insignificant, tangential</b> and <b>inappropriate</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some of the sources are placed in the current context of the project.</li> <li>Some of the sources cited are <b>not well selected</b> and <b>do not contribute adequately</b> to the discussion raised in the literature review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of the sources are placed in the current context of the project.</li> <li>Sources are appropriate and well aligned to support discussion raised in literature review/project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The majority of the sources are placed in the current context of the project.</li> <li>Sources are <b>significant</b> and <b>relevant</b> to the support the literature review/project.</li> </ul>
<b>SOURCES (Range &amp; Reliability)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The review of literature consisted of non-research based articles.</li> <li><b>Few</b> or <b>no</b> sources consulted (mainly non-academic, online sources)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Some attempt</b> to consult several sources (&lt;10).</li> <li>Some selected literature was from unreliable sources.</li> <li>There is limited <b>variety</b> in the sources consulted (mainly non-academic sources)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Ample</b> sources consulted (10-14)</li> <li>The literature was largely based on reliable sources.</li> <li>Peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature are cited</li> <li>A reasonable <b>variety</b> in the sources is seen (academic, print and non-print, online)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Extensive</b> sources consulted (15-20)</li> <li>The literature was based on reliable sources.</li> <li>Peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature are cited</li> <li>A significant <b>variety</b> of sources are consulted (academic, print and non-print, online)</li> </ul>
<b>PROCEDURES</b>	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).

At least 34 points = Advance to Finals

Suggestions for improvements:

Judge's name : \_\_\_\_\_

Signature : \_\_\_\_\_

Marks : \_\_\_\_/52