



EXAMINATION AND GRADUATION DIVISION  
ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATION SERVICES DEPARTMENT  
UNIVERSITI MALAYA, 50603 KUALA LUMPUR  
Email: bpp\_aasd@um.edu.my

## CANDIDATURE DEFENCE EVALUATION

**Note:**

1. The candidature defence should be presented no later than 3<sup>rd</sup> semester of study for **Master's candidates** and the 5<sup>th</sup> semester of study for **Doctoral candidates** (Full Time Candidates) or no later than 4<sup>th</sup> semester of study for **Master's candidates** and the 6<sup>th</sup> semester of study for **Doctoral candidates** (Part Time Candidates) as a partial fulfilment of research candidature requirements.
2. The objectives of the candidature defence are to monitor the research progress of the candidate and to give feedback on how to further improve the research.
3. This form is to be completed by the panel of assessors in response to the candidature defence presentation. The panel of assessors would have received and read the candidate's written proposal in order to be able to support the confirmation.

Candidate's Details			
<b>Name:</b>		<b>Matric Number:</b>	
<b>Programme:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral <input type="checkbox"/> Masters		
<b>Mode of Programme:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Research <input type="checkbox"/> Mixed Mode <input type="checkbox"/> Coursework <input type="checkbox"/> Clinical		
<b>Mode of Study:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Full Time <input type="checkbox"/> Part Time	<b>Current Semester:</b>	
<b>Title of Thesis / Dissertation:</b>			
<b>Date of Presentation:</b>			
<b>Supervisor (s):</b>			

## Marking Rubric

POOR  (unacceptable & requires major revision)	UNSATISFACTORY  (unacceptable & requires major revision)	SATISFACTORY  (acceptable with major revision)	GOOD  (acceptable with minor revisions)	EXCELLENT  (acceptable with minor or no revision)	MARKS OBTAINED  (Tick your marks)																		
1	2	3	4	5																			
Introduction (10%)																							
The introduction does not reflect the work done.	The introduction <b>fails to address</b> the following:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>problem/issues</li><li>overview of a research framework</li><li>research questions/objectives</li><li>significance of the study</li><li>operational terms/definitions (if applicable)</li></ul>	The introduction <b>attempts to address most</b> of the following:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>problem/issues</li><li>overview of a research framework</li><li>research questions/objectives</li><li>significance of the study</li><li>operational terms/definitions (if applicable)</li></ul>	The introduction addresses all the following appropriately:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>problem/issues</li><li>overview of a research framework</li><li>research questions/objectives</li><li>significance of the study</li><li>operational terms/definitions (if applicable)</li></ul>	The introduction addresses all the following <b>very clearly</b> :  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>problem/issues</li><li>overview of a research framework</li><li>research questions/objectives</li><li>significance of the study</li><li>operational terms/definitions (if applicable)</li></ul>	(scale given / 5) * 10 <table><tr><th>Scale</th><th>Marks</th><th>Tick</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>2.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>4.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>6.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>8.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>10.00</td><td></td></tr></table> <b>Marks:</b>	Scale	Marks	Tick	1	2.00		2	4.00		3	6.00		4	8.00		5	10.00	
Scale	Marks	Tick																					
1	2.00																						
2	4.00																						
3	6.00																						
4	8.00																						
5	10.00																						
Literature review (25%)																							
The review fails to address all or most of the following:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature.</li><li>Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to validity, and opinion vs. evidence</li></ul>	The <b>review fails to address</b> the following:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature.</li><li>Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to validity, and opinion vs. evidence.</li></ul>	The review <b>attempts to address most</b> of the following:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature.</li><li>Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to validity, and opinion vs. evidence.</li></ul>	The review appropriately addresses all of the following:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature.</li><li>Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to validity, and opinion vs. evidence.</li></ul>	The review aptly addresses all the following:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature.</li><li>Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to validity, and opinion vs. evidence.</li></ul>	(scale given / 5) * 25 <table><tr><th>Scale</th><th>Marks</th><th>Tick</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>5.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>10.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>15.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>20.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>25.00</td><td></td></tr></table> <b>Marks:</b>	Scale	Marks	Tick	1	5.00		2	10.00		3	15.00		4	20.00		5	25.00	
Scale	Marks	Tick																					
1	5.00																						
2	10.00																						
3	15.00																						
4	20.00																						
5	25.00																						

POOR  (unacceptable & requires major revision)	UNSATISFACTORY  (unacceptable & requires major revision)	SATISFACTORY  (acceptable with major revision)	GOOD  (acceptable with minor revisions)	EXCELLENT  (acceptable with minor or no revision)	MARKS OBTAINED  (Tick your marks)																		
1	2	3	4	5																			
Conceptual Framework / Methods / Approach (20%)																							
<p>The description of the conceptual framework and methodology is <b>not</b> clear and corresponding justification is <b>unconvincing</b> and <b>not</b> in accordance with acceptable research conventions. Fails to address all or most of the following, but could be more convincing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>theoretical framework</li><li>research sample, sample procedure and technique</li><li>instrumentation</li><li>data collection procedures</li></ul>	<p>The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology <b>fails to address</b> the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>theoretical framework</li><li>research sample, sample procedure and technique</li><li>instrumentation</li><li>data collection procedures</li><li>data analysis method</li><li>validity and reliability / trustworthiness approaches</li><li>ethical aspects and issues</li><li>strengths and weakness of approach, technique, or procedures used</li></ul>	<p>The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology <b>attempts to address most</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>theoretical framework</li><li>research sample, sample procedure and technique</li><li>instrumentation</li><li>data collection procedures</li><li>data analysis method</li><li>validity and reliability / trustworthiness approaches</li><li>ethical aspects and issues</li><li>strengths and weakness of approach, technique, or procedures used</li></ul>	<p>The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology appropriately address all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>theoretical framework</li><li>research sample, sample procedure and technique</li><li>instrumentation</li><li>data collection procedures</li><li>data analysis method</li><li>validity and reliability / trustworthiness approaches</li><li>ethical aspects and issues</li><li>strengths and weakness of approach, technique, or procedures used</li></ul>	<p>The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology aptly address all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>theoretical framework</li><li>research sample, sample procedure and technique</li><li>instrumentation</li><li>data collection procedures</li><li>data analysis method</li><li>validity and reliability / trustworthiness approaches</li><li>ethical aspects and issues</li><li>strengths and weakness of approach, technique, or procedures used</li></ul>	<p>(scale given / 5) * 20</p> <table><tr><th>Scale</th><th>Marks</th><th>Tick</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>4.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>8.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>12.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>16.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>20.00</td><td></td></tr></table> <p><b>Marks:</b></p>	Scale	Marks	Tick	1	4.00		2	8.00		3	12.00		4	16.00		5	20.00	
Scale	Marks	Tick																					
1	4.00																						
2	8.00																						
3	12.00																						
4	16.00																						
5	20.00																						

POOR  (unacceptable & requires major revision)	UNSATISFACTORY  (unacceptable & requires major revision)	SATISFACTORY  (acceptable with major revision)	GOOD  (acceptable with minor revisions)	EXCELLENT  (acceptable with minor or no revision)	MARKS OBTAINED  (Tick your marks)																		
1	2	3	4	5																			
Results and Discussions (20%)																							
<p>The results and discussion <b>fail to illustrate</b> the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>answer the research questions and /or fulfill research objectives / hypotheses raised.</li><li>Results are well analysed and interpreted.</li><li>Findings address the research problems/issues.</li><li>Show the research significance and contribution.</li></ul>	<p>The results and discussion <b>fail to illustrate</b> the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>answer the research questions and /or fulfill research objectives / hypotheses raised.</li><li>Results are well analysed and interpreted.</li><li>Findings address the research problems/issues.</li><li>Show the research significance and contribution.</li></ul>	<p>The results and discussion <b>illustrate most</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>answer the research questions and /or fulfill research objectives / hypotheses raised.</li><li>Results are well analysed and interpreted.</li><li>Findings address the research problems/issues.</li><li>Show the research significance and contribution.</li></ul>	<p>The results and discussion appropriately <b>illustrate</b> all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>answer the research questions and /or fulfill research objectives / hypotheses raised.</li><li>Results are well analysed and interpreted.</li><li>Findings address the research problems/issues.</li><li>Show the research significance and contribution.</li></ul>	<p>The results and discussion aptly <b>illustrate all</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The research objectives are fulfilled /research questions or hypotheses raised are addressed.</li><li>Results are well analysed and interpreted.</li><li>Findings address the research problems/issues.</li><li>the research significance and contribution are shown.</li></ul> <p>The candidate also critically uses the best available analytical techniques and/or appropriately proposes new ones.</p>	<p>(scale given / 5) * 20</p> <table><tr><th>Scale</th><th>Marks</th><th>Tick</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>4.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>8.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>12.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>16.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>20.00</td><td></td></tr></table> <p><b>Marks:</b></p>	Scale	Marks	Tick	1	4.00		2	8.00		3	12.00		4	16.00		5	20.00	
Scale	Marks	Tick																					
1	4.00																						
2	8.00																						
3	12.00																						
4	16.00																						
5	20.00																						
Conclusion (10%)																							
<p>The conclusion fail to address all or most of the following clearly and convincingly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Restate the objectives</li><li>Summarize the findings</li><li>Provide the research continuation plan.</li></ul>	<p>The conclusion <b>fails to do</b> the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Restate the objectives</li><li>Summarize the findings</li><li>Provide the research continuation plan.</li></ul>	<p>The conclusion <b>vaguely does</b> the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Restate the objectives</li><li>Summarize the findings</li><li>Provide the research continuation plan.</li></ul>	<p>The conclusion clearly do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Restate the objectives</li><li>Summarise the findings</li><li>Provide the research continuation plan.</li></ul>	<p>The conclusion <b>clearly, and convincingly</b> do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Restate the objectives</li><li>Summarise the findings</li><li>Provide the research continuation plan.</li></ul>	<p>(scale given / 5) * 10</p> <table><tr><th>Scale</th><th>Marks</th><th>Tick</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>2.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>4.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>6.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>8.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>10.00</td><td></td></tr></table> <p><b>Marks:</b></p>	Scale	Marks	Tick	1	2.00		2	4.00		3	6.00		4	8.00		5	10.00	
Scale	Marks	Tick																					
1	2.00																						
2	4.00																						
3	6.00																						
4	8.00																						
5	10.00																						

POOR  (unacceptable & requires major revision)	UNSATISFACTORY  (unacceptable & requires major revision)	SATISFACTORY  (acceptable with major revision)	GOOD  (acceptable with minor revisions)	EXCELLENT  (acceptable with minor or no revision)	MARKS OBTAINED  (Tick your marks)																		
1	2	3	4	5																			
Academic Style, Language and References (10%)																							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Failure to apply standard rules for manuscript presentation and language composition Errors begin to impede readability. Significant editing needed. Several errors per paragraph informal language used in multiple instances</li><li>The reference list is incomplete and inaccuracies.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>No consistent use of style for references, in-text citations, proposal structure and specific mechanics.</li><li>The academic language carries inappropriate tone and use of vague as well as inaccurate terminology, expressions and signposting. Language inaccuracies impede the readability of the proposal.</li><li>Significant editing needed.</li><li>Several errors per paragraph and informal language used in multiple instances</li><li>The reference list is incomplete and inaccurate.</li><li>No adherence to word limit; not more than 500 words (abstract), 10,000 words (proposal report excluding reference)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Inconsistent use of style for references, in-text citations, proposal structure and specific mechanics.</li><li>The academic language clearly lacks formal and objective tone and use of clear, precise and accurate terminology, expressions and signposting. Language inaccuracies impede the full understanding of the proposal.</li><li>Moderate editing needed.</li><li>The reference list is incomplete and / or contains some inaccuracies.</li><li>Adherence to word limit; not more than 500 words (abstract), 10,000 words (proposal report excluding reference)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Slightly lacking in consistent use of style for references, in-text citations, proposal structure and specific mechanics.</li><li>The academic language slightly lacks formal and objective tone and use of clear, precise and accurate terminology, expressions and signposting. Some language errors are present but they do not affect a full understanding of the proposal.</li><li>The reference list is mostly complete and accurate.</li><li>Adherence to word limit; not more than 500 words (abstract), 10,000 words (proposal report excluding reference)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Consistent use of style for references, in-text citations, proposal structure and specific mechanics.</li><li>The academic language demonstrates formal and objective tone and use of clear, precise and accurate terminology, expressions and signposting. There might be minimal first draft slips.</li><li>The reference list is complete and accurate.</li><li>Adherence to word limit; not more than 500 words (abstract), 10,000 words (proposal report excluding reference)</li></ul>	<div>(scale given / 5) * 10</div> <table><tr><th>Scale</th><th>Marks</th><th>Tick</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>2.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>4.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>6.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>8.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>10.00</td><td></td></tr></table> <div>Marks:</div>	Scale	Marks	Tick	1	2.00		2	4.00		3	6.00		4	8.00		5	10.00	
Scale	Marks	Tick																					
1	2.00																						
2	4.00																						
3	6.00																						
4	8.00																						
5	10.00																						

POOR  (unacceptable & requires major revision)	UNSATISFACTORY  (unacceptable & requires major revision)	SATISFACTORY  (acceptable with major revision)	GOOD  (acceptable with minor revisions)	EXCELLENT  (acceptable with minor or no revision)	MARKS OBTAINED  (Tick your marks)																		
1	2	3	4	5																			
Communication / Presentation (Q&A) (5%)																							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The candidate unable to deliver all questions raised.</li><li>Research information is presented in no logical sequence.</li><li>Voice not clear, hesitation and no body-language</li></ul>	<p>The candidate fails to demonstrate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Present research information in almost no logical sequence.</li><li>Express ideas clearly, fluently, and confidently.</li><li>Not able to answer most of the questions asked.</li></ul>	<p>The candidate attempts to demonstrate most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Present research information in less logical sequence.</li><li>Express ideas clearly, fluently, and confidently.</li><li>Able to answer questions asked.</li></ul>	<p>The candidate demonstrates all the following appropriately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Present research information in sequence that can be followed.</li><li>Express ideas clearly, fluently, and confidently.</li><li>Good ability to answer questions asked.</li></ul>	<p>The candidate demonstrates all the following very clearly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Present research information in a logical, interesting and effective sequence and easy to follow.</li><li>Express ideas clearly, fluently, and confidently.</li><li>Very good ability to answer questions asked.</li></ul>	<p>(scale given / 5) * 5</p> <table><tr><th>Scale</th><th>Marks</th><th>Tick</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>1.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>2.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>3.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>4.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>5.00</td><td></td></tr></table> <p><b>Marks:</b></p>	Scale	Marks	Tick	1	1.00		2	2.00		3	3.00		4	4.00		5	5.00	
Scale	Marks	Tick																					
1	1.00																						
2	2.00																						
3	3.00																						
4	4.00																						
5	5.00																						
	*TOTAL MARKS:																						

\*Note – Based on UM grading scheme, the passing mark is 65.00 and above.

## Marking Scheme

Marks	Grade	Grade Point	Interpretation
90.00 – 100.00	A+	4.00	PASS
80.00 – 89.99	A	4.00	
75.00 – 79.99	A-	3.70	
70.00 – 74.99	B+	3.30	
65.00 – 69.99	B	3.00	
0.00 – 64.99	FAIL and Repeat Candidature Defence Seminar or Terminated from Study		

## Originality

\*Turnitin – Similarity Index Percentage : \_\_\_\_\_ %

\*Please refer to the University/Faculty guideline for the acceptable similarity index percentage.

## Overall Comments

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

Name : \_\_\_\_\_

Date : \_\_\_\_\_

Official Stamp : \_\_\_\_\_