

# Researched Persuasive Writing and Speaking

## ***New for 2020-2021***

Competitor orientation deleted from ILC.  
Paper will be submitted electronically for ILC (no hard copies required).  
Title page and formatting requirements have been updated.  
Editorial changes have been made in the guidelines for clarity.  
Rating sheet has been updated to reflect guideline changes.

### **Event Summary**

Researched Persuasive Writing and Speaking provides HOSA members with the opportunity to gain knowledge and skills required for researching a health issue, preparing written documentation supporting a thesis, and presenting information orally. This competitive event requires competitors to develop a speech and written paper, either for or against, the provided annual health topic.

**Topic for 2020-2021:**  
**Technology Use: Does it Make Us More or Less Connected?**

**Dress Code** Competitors must be in official HOSA uniform or in proper business attire. Bonus points will be awarded for [proper dress](#).

### **General Rules**

1. Competitors in this event must be active members of HOSA and in good standing.
2. Secondary and Postsecondary / Collegiate divisions are eligible to compete in this event.
3. Competitors must be familiar with and adhere to the [“General Rules and Regulations of the HOSA Competitive Events Program \(GRR\).”](#)
4. All competitors shall report to the site of the event at the time designated for each round of competition. At ILC, competitor’s [photo ID](#) must be presented prior to ALL competition rounds.

### **The Research Paper**

5. The research paper will include the following four (4) pages:

➤ Page 1	Title Page
➤ Pages 2 and 3	Body of paper
➤ Page 4	Reference page
6. **Title Page:** Create a title page, including the event name, Competitor Name, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, State/Assoc, Title of Paper including Topic Stance, Title page centered, One page only. (A creative design or pictures may be used but will not affect the score.)

7. **Body of Paper** formatting:
  - A. Pages are one-sided, typed
  - B. 12 pt. Arial font, double-spaced, in English
  - C. 1" margins on 8 ½" x 11" paper
  - D. Running header with last name, event and page number top right side of each page (not counting title page)
8. **Reference Page:** List the literature cited to give guidance to the written paper and speech. American Psychological Association (APA) is the preferred resource in Health Sciences. One page only. *Points will be awarded for compiling a clean, legible reference page, but the formatting of the reference page is not judged.*
9. No plagiarism is allowed and work must be that of the competitors per the [GRR #14-16](#).

### The Speech

10. The speech may or may not be worded exactly as written in the researched written paper. The main ideas must remain the same but the competitor may elaborate in the speech.
  - a. Competitors may choose to bring their paper to ILC competition, to reference during the speech, but no points are awarded on the rating sheet for doing so.
11. Use of index card notes during the speech is permitted. Electronic notecards (on a tablet, smart phone, laptop, etc.) are permitted, but may not be shown to judges. Props may *not* be used.
12. The speech may be up to four (4) minutes in length. The timekeeper shall present a flash card advising the competitor when there is one (1) minute remaining. The competitor will be stopped when the four minutes are up and dismissed, allowing the judges five (5) minutes to rate the speech and paper.
13. Time Schedule:
 

4 minutes for competitor's speech
5 minutes for rating the speech and paper

### Final Scoring

14. Should a tie occur, scores on the rating sheet section(s) with the highest point value(s) will be used, in descending order, to break the tie.

### Required Digital Uploads

15. The complete paper must be uploaded as a single document, pdf preferred, by competitor:
  - a. to Tallo for Secondary & Postsecondary/Collegiate divisions
  - b. Uploads for ILC will be open from April 15th - May 15th for ILC qualified competitors only.

Instructions for uploading materials to Tallo (Secondary/Postsecondary divisions only) can be found [HERE](#).

*NOTE: States have the option to use hard copy submissions instead of digital submissions. Please check with your State Advisor to determine what process is used in your state. For ILC, only digital submissions will be used for judging if uploaded by May 15th.*

16. Reminder to refer to [GRR #24](#): By entering this event, competitor's materials become property of HOSA – Future Health Professionals, and are not returned to the competitors. Competitors are encouraged to retain all original documents and videos, so that between each level of competition materials can be submitted as indicated. Materials will NOT be mailed or shared from Area/Regional to State or to International competition.

**Competitor Must Provide:**

- Research paper uploaded to Tallo by published deadline
- Watch with second hand (optional)
- Index cards or electronic notecards (optional)
- [Photo ID](#)

## RESEARCHED PERSUASIVE WRITING AND SPEAKING Judges Rating Sheet

Section # \_\_\_\_\_ Competitor # \_\_\_\_\_

Division: \_\_\_\_\_ SS \_\_\_\_\_ PS/C \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

*One PDF File of the completed paper Uploaded Online\*: Yes \_\_\_ No*

*If the materials are not uploaded, note that applicable items on the rubric below cannot be judged.*

A. The Speech	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 9 points	Fair 6 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
<b>1. Introduction</b>	The competitor grabs the attention of the audience in a way that is creative, imaginative and thoughtful. The thesis statement is clearly revealed and well-structured for speech.	The competitor draws in the audience with their introduction and piques their interest to want to learn more. The thesis statement connects to body of the speech.	The competitor provides an average introduction of the topic and slightly sparks the interest and attention of the audience.	The introduction provided by the competitor lacks attention to detail and connection to the overall point of the speech.	The competitor does not provide an introduction that draws in the audience and captures their attention.	
<b>2. Overall coverage of event topic and quality of information.</b>	Information included high-quality details that support the event topic in a thorough manner. Research was in-depth and beyond the obvious, revealing new insights. Overall, the coverage of the topic was excellent.	Information included sufficient detail relevant to the topic. Research seemed to be in-depth. The coverage of the topic was good.	The quality of the information was limited to support the topic. The competitor provided an average amount of coverage on the topic.	Some information provided was relevant to the topic. Research provided was mostly surface-level and the competitor missed key points of the topic.	Information was unreliable and interfered with ability of the audience to understand the speech. Research was irrelevant to the topic and the competitor missed the point of the topic.	
<b>3. Conclusion</b>	The competitor reviews the thesis and main points of speech in a memorable and effective way that provides an effective flow leading to the conclusion.	The competitor reviews the thesis and main points of speech in a clear way that provides an adequate flow leading to the conclusion.	The competitor reviews the thesis and main points clearly. Underwhelming conclusion.	The competitor is missing a review of the thesis or main points. The conclusion was hard to follow.	Review of the thesis and main points are missing from the conclusion.	
	Excellent 20 points	Good 15 points	Average 10 points	Fair 5 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
<b>4. Persuasiveness</b>	The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic.	The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive.	The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view.	

<b>B. Speech Delivery</b>	<b>Excellent 5 points</b>	<b>Good 4 points</b>	<b>Average 3 points</b>	<b>Fair 2 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>1. Voice</b> Pitch, tempo, volume, quality	The competitor's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitor varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.	The competitor spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitor varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted.	The competitor could be heard most of the time. The competitor attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not always successfully.	The competitor's voice is low. Judges have difficulty hearing the presentation.	Judge had difficulty hearing and/or understanding much of the speech due to low volume. Little variety in rate or volume.	
<b>2. Stage Presence</b> Poise, posture, eye contact, and enthusiasm	Movements & gestures were purposeful and enhanced the delivery of the speech and did not distract. Body language reflects comfort interacting with audience. Facial expressions and body language consistently generated a strong interest and enthusiasm for the topic.	The competitor maintained adequate posture and non-distracting movement during the speech. Some gestures were used. Facial expressions and body language generated an interest and enthusiasm for the topic.	Stiff or unnatural use of nonverbal behaviors. Body language reflects some discomfort interacting with audience. Limited use of gestures to reinforce verbal message. Facial expressions and body language are used to try to generate enthusiasm but seem somewhat forced.	The competitor's posture, body language, and facial expressions indicated a lack of enthusiasm for the topic. Movements were distracting.	No attempt was made to use body movement or gestures to enhance the message. No interest or enthusiasm for the topic came through in presentation.	
<b>3. Diction*, Pronunciation** and Grammar</b>	Delivery emphasizes and enhances message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. No vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone heightened interest and complemented the verbal message.	Delivery helps to enhance message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. Minimal vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone complemented the verbal message	Delivery adequate. Enunciation and pronunciation suitable. Noticeable verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone seemed inconsistent at times.	Delivery quality minimal. Regular verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Delivery problems cause disruption to message.	Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.	

<b>C. Written Paper</b>	<b>Excellent 10 points</b>	<b>Good 8 points</b>	<b>Average 6 points</b>	<b>Fair 4 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>1. Opening Statement</b>	Writer grabs attention of reader. The introduction is creative, imaginative and thoughtful. Thesis clearly revealed and well-structured for the paper. Forecasts body of paper in a memorable and effective way.	Writer somewhat grabs the attention of the reader. Thesis stated and appropriate for the paper. Forecasts body so audience knows main points in brevity.	Audience is reading with some engagement.  Thesis needs strength or structure. Forecast incomplete.	Attention device is unrelated to the topic. Thesis missing OR forecast statement missing.	Paper not submitted OR attention device is missing. Thesis inappropriate or missing AND forecast is missing or indistinguishable.	
<b>2. Coverage of Event Topic and Quality of Information</b>	Information included high-quality details that support the topic in a thorough manner. Research was in-depth and beyond the obvious, revealing new insights. Overall, the coverage of the topic was excellent.	Information included sufficient detail relevant to the topic. Research seemed to be in-depth. The coverage of the topic was good.	The quality of the information was limited to support the topic. The competitor provided an average amount of coverage on the topic.	Some information provided was relevant to the topic. Research provided was mostly surface-level and the competitor missed key points of the topic.	Paper not submitted OR information was unreliable and interfered with ability of the audience to understand the speech. Research was irrelevant to the topic and the competitor missed the point of the topic.	
<b>3. Originality</b>	Writing reflects the original thoughts of the author and extends a creative or unique idea, question or concept on the topic. No evidence of plagiarism.	Writing reflects the original thoughts of the author and provides some unique ideas on the topic. No evidence of plagiarism.	Some original thoughts are provided by the author. Creativity is experimented with on the topic. No evidence of plagiarism.	Limited originality is provided by the author on the topic. No evidence of plagiarism.	Paper not submitted OR There was evidence of plagiarism.	
<b>4. Conclusion</b>	Conclusion is concise and summarizes supporting points: restates the thesis in a new way. The reader is satisfied with the conclusion and is left with something to think about.	Conclusion is mostly concise and summarizes the supporting points. The reader is indifferent with the conclusion of the essay.	Conclusion provides a summary of supporting points: it does not restate the thesis.	Conclusion may be attempted but does not summarize or restate thesis.	Paper not submitted OR no conclusion is apparent in the essay.	
<b>C. Written Paper</b>	<b>Excellent 20 points</b>	<b>Good 15 points</b>	<b>Average 10 points</b>	<b>Fair 5 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>5. Persuasiveness</b>	The paper was exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic.	The paper was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	The paper was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	The paper provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive.	Paper not submitted OR the paper was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view.	

<b>C. Written Paper</b>	<b>Excellent 5 points</b>	<b>Good 4 points</b>	<b>Average 3 points</b>	<b>Fair 2 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>6. Title Page</b>	Title Page includes Competitor Name, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, State/Assoc, Title of Paper including Topic Stance, Title page centered, One page only.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Paper not submitted OR title page does not include all requirements OR is not present.	
<b>7. Transitions</b>	Writing has voice and is easily read aloud. Appropriate transitions are used to move from one supporting detail to the next. Word choice and syntax offer surprise, clarity and "just right" wording.	Writing has some voice and is easily read aloud. Transitions are used, but better wording could have been used.	Vocabulary or writing style needs further development in sentence variety, word choice, and fluency. Some basic transitions used.	Sentences are short, fragmented or run-ons. Flow of essay is hard to follow. Few to no transitions are used.	Paper not submitted OR no flow to writing. Difficult for reader to follow. No transitions used	
<b>8. Grammar</b>	Zero (0) grammatical errors found in this essay.	1-2 grammatical errors were found in this essay. They do not detract from the general flow of the essay.	3-4 errors were found in the essay, and they detract from the overall flow of the essay.	There are 5-6 grammatical errors present which detract from the overall meaning and flow of the essay.	Paper not submitted OR more than 6 errors were found in this essay. The errors are glaring, and the essay is difficult to read.	
<b>9. Spelling &amp; Punctuation</b>	Zero (0) errors in spelling and punctuation were found in this essay.	1-2 errors in spelling or punctuation were found in this essay.	3-4 errors in spelling or punctuation in this essay.	5 errors in spelling or punctuation were found in this essay.	Paper not submitted OR more than 5 errors in spelling or punctuation were documented within the essay.	
<b>10. Formatting</b>	Pages are one-sided, typed, 12 pt. Arial font, double-spaced, in English, 1" margins on 8 ½" x 11" paper, Running header with last name, event and page number top right side of each page (not counting title page). Max two pages (plus Title and Reference page)	N/A	N/A	N/A	Paper not submitted OR all requirements are not met.	

<b>C. Written Paper</b>	<b>Excellent 5 points</b>	<b>Good 4 points</b>	<b>Average 3 points</b>	<b>Fair 2 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>11. Reference Page</b>	The reference page is included with the paper and includes: Event name, Competitor/Team Member Names, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, State/Assoc	NA	NA	NA	Paper not submitted OR no reference page is included OR all items are not included.	
<b>Total Points (170):</b>						

\* Definition of Diction – Choice of words especially with regard to correctness, clearness, and effectiveness.

\*\* Definition of Pronunciation – Act or manner of uttering officially.