

HWA CHONG INSTITUTION (HIGH SCHOOL) PROJECTS COMPETITION 2013
CATEGORY 2: Non-Experimental Research Semi-Finals Round Judging Form

ORAL PRESENTATION	1	2	3	4
<p>PRESENTERS (Individual)</p> <p>(Group)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appears uninterested, lacks confidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Somewhat confident, • Not very consistent: some hesitancy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents with enthusiasm and expressive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural, confident and expressive. • Good delivery style.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uneven involvement of group members (mainly 1 dominant , enthusiastic presenter) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uneven involvement (mainly 2 dominant presenters) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most members contribute to the oral presentation • Most members are enthusiastic, confident, and expressive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All presenters equally involved • All members have good delivery style.
DELIVERY/EYE CONTACT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mumbles or speaks too soft • lack confidence and expression. • Occasionally maintains eye contact, but mostly reads off a script. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulation and pronunciation not very clear • Maintains eye contact most of the time but frequently reads off notes/slides. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulation and pronunciation are generally clear • Maintains eye contact with audience, well-prepared, occasional reference to notes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enthusiastic, confident, and expressive. • Articulation and pronunciation are very clear. • 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 response 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.

HWA CHONG INSTITUTION (HIGH SCHOOL) PROJECTS COMPETITION 2013
CATEGORY 2: Non-Experimental Research Semi-Finals Round Judging Form

LITERATURE REVIEW	1	2	3	4
COMMAND OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW PROCESS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor command of the literature review process: Mere descriptions of previous research in the field of study, with no evaluation. 	<p>Satisfactory command of the literature review process: some expansion and elaboration (<i>but inadequate</i>) of previous research in the field of study.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sound command of the literature review process: Ample evaluation and elaboration of previous research in the field of study. 	<p>Exceptional command of the literature review process: justified critique of previous research in the field of study.</p>
CHOICE OF RESEARCH LITERATURE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The review of literature is insignificant or consisted of non-research based articles. No link between the research literature and the thesis statement/research questions. Uses only non-academic online sources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A key construct or variable is not connected to the research literature. Selected literature is from unreliable sources. Lacking in a clear link between the research literature and the thesis statements/research questions. Uses mainly non-academic online sources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key constructs and variables are connected to relevant and reliable theoretical and research literature. Most of the research literature and the thesis statement/research questions are connected. A good variety of sources are used (academic, print and non-print, online). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and landmark research literature. The research literature and thesis statement/research questions are closely aligned. A wide variety of sources are used (<i>academic, print and non-print, online</i>).
CRITIQUE OF LITERATURE (Interpretation/Analysis and Synthesis)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interpretation comes from a purely personal perspective that lacks academic rigour. (<i>Propositions are irrelevant, inaccurate, or inappropriate</i>). Lacking in analysis and synthesis of ideas. Limitations and assumptions are omitted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interpretation lacks depth, clarity and justification. (<i>Literary supports are vague or ambiguous</i>). Some attempt made to show analysis and synthesis of ideas. Important limitations and assumptions have not been identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some efforts at in-depth interpretation. Provides concluding remarks that show evidence of analysis and synthesis of ideas. Some limitations and assumptions have been identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-depth interpretation that contextualizes research within literature review. The analysis and synthesis of ideas highly evident throughout. Appropriate and important limitations and assumptions have been clearly stated.
REFERENCING	No referencing protocols used, e.g. 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).

HWA CHONG INSTITUTION (HIGH SCHOOL) PROJECTS COMPETITION 2013
CATEGORY 2: Non-Experimental Research Semi-Finals Round Judging Form

METHODOLOGY	1	2	3	4
RESEARCH DESIGN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research design is inappropriate or has not been identified and or described using standard terminology. Limitations and assumptions are omitted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research design is confusing or incomplete given the research questions and sampling strategy. Some limitations and assumptions have been identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research design has been identified and described in sufficiently detailed terms. Limitations and assumptions have been identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose, questions, and research design are mutually supportive and coherent. Attention has been given to eliminating alternative explanations and controlling extraneous variables. Appropriate and important limitations and assumptions have been clearly stated.
CONTEXT, POPULATION SAMPLING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The context, population, or sample was not identified or described. The sampling strategy was inappropriate for the research questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The description of the context, population, or sampling strategy was confusing, lacked relevance to the purpose The sampling process was incomplete, and the project design has failed to identify specific quantitative or qualitative details 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The context, population, and sampling strategy was adequately identified and described. The size of population, sample and comparison groups was identified. Lacking in some sampling considerations (eg: extraneous factors, sampling errors) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The description of the context and population was meaningful, including both quantitative and qualitative description. The sampling process was reasonable to recruit a representative sample of the population. Attention was given to controlling for extraneous factors and sampling error.
INSTRUMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instruments and observation protocols for gathering data were not identified by name or described in a meaningful way. The validity and reliability information was not addressed/considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of the instruments (purpose, form, and elements) or observation protocols were confusing, incomplete, or lacked relevance to the research questions and variables 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instruments and observation protocols were identified by name and described and demonstrated relevance to the research design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurate and detailed descriptions of instruments and observation protocols which included purpose statements, type and number of items, and type of scores. Reasonable evidence of validity and reliability was presented and were based on existing research protocols.
PROCEDURES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures for the treatment of and the gathering of data were omitted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures (permissions, treatments, and data gathering) were confusing, incomplete, or lacked relevance to purpose, research questions, or sampling strategy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures for implementing the study (permissions, treatments, and data gathering) were identified and described in a chronological AND/OR logical fashion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures were thorough, manageable, coherent, and powerful for generating valid and reliable data. The research procedure was chronological and repeatable, with clear distinctions between researcher and participant actions. Clear and reasonable strategies were presented for seeking permissions and for the ethical treatment of human subjects

HWA CHONG INSTITUTION (HIGH SCHOOL) PROJECTS COMPETITION 2013
CATEGORY 2: Non-Experimental Research Semi-Finals Round Judging Form

<p>DATA COLLECTION</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy / method adopted fails to answer research(s) question • Unclear/No explanation of how sampling techniques were used. • No pre-test or modifications performed based on feedback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy / method adopted does not adequately answer research question(s) • Lacking in an adequate explanation of the sampling techniques used. • Shows some evidence of pre-test and modification of survey questions – BUT the measures are less than adequate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy / method adopted answers research question (s) quite well • An adequate explanation of sampling techniques used was given. • Shows evidence of pre-test and follow up with some modification of survey questions (incorporating relevant feedback). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy / method adopted answers research question(s) convincingly • A clear, detailed and accurate explanation of the sampling technique used was given • Shows evidence of pre-test and follow up with modification of survey questions • Accurate and repeatable tests for reliability & validity were carried out.
-------------------------------	---	---	--	--

Minimum score to proceed to the Finals: 26

Judge's name : _____ Signature : _____ Marks : _____/52