



Government
of South Australia

SACE
Board of SA

2014 STAGE 2 RESEARCH PROJECT B (2RPB10)

A Car and its owner

Student Name: _____

Summary

My Research Project question was asking what the relationship is between a car and its owner. A summary of my outcome consisted of five key findings. These five key findings involved discovering that cars are seen as living entities, each relationship between a car and its owner is unique, cars are an extension of their owner, owners tend to personify their vehicle and that a relationship between a car and its owner can be deemed unexplainable. Discovering these key findings was an evident part in formulating my outcome which has allowed me to answer my research project question.

S3 Generally clear and coherent outline of the research question and of the key findings and their relationship to the outcome.

Research Processes

I chose research processes which involved both gathering primary sources and secondary sources. For my primary recourses, I turned to interviewing and surveying as means of information. In terms of secondary sources, I investigated websites blogs and movie documentary directed by Eric Bana, *Love the Beast (2009)*. I used such secondary sources as they proved appropriate in giving me the information that I needed, which was that of discovering the basics of what a relationship between a car and its owner actually meant. Website blogs provided me with a formal understanding of what it meant to share a relationship with a car. Due to the limited information that was provided however, it allowed me to set an objective of what I needed to discover in my primary sourced research processes. Eric Bana's film was also a great source of secondary data, as some aspects of the car/owner relationship within the film connected with similar information gathered from website blogs. This resulted in great validity and reliability in my secondary sourced research.

E1
Considered explanation of why research processes used.

E1 Discussion of validity and reliability through comparing data collected.

In regards to obtaining primary sources, I used two very common research processes which proved the most effective and valuable in terms of the quality of my information. I first interviewed ^{Expert} from ^{Expert} Auto Service (), which supplied me with rather significant and important information. This was quite useful in as it appeared elsewhere in surveying which increased both the reliability and validity of the information which further evolved into key findings. My fourth and last research process was surveying a local car club. As mentioned earlier, the information that was gathered through surveying was closely linked to what ^{Expert} had to say about the topic, ultimately increasing the reliability of the process. However, I was limited to only one car club as I time restrictions were an issue.

E1
Discussion of the usefulness of the data collected through primary sources.

E1 Considered evaluation of effectiveness and value of the quality of the information. The importance of cross referencing to show reliability and validity is discussed. Recognition of limitations of using only one source.

E1
Considered evaluation of the research process in explanation of how limited information led to setting of objective.

E1 Recognition of the importance of the question to the evaluation of processes used.

The usefulness of my research process was very effective. In terms of secondary sources, not much discovery was made, however this may be due to uniqueness of the question. As I stated earlier, not many people establish a relationship with their car. Although I discovered that the car/owner relationship may be a long term commitment, information provided by Eric Bana's documentary and website blogs proved otherwise useless. However not being completely worthless, it still did not help me answer my research question. This had made me realise that for me to obtain good quality information, I must look to a different research process in terms of obtaining primary sources, which is what I decided to do. Keeping in mind that such a question only applies to select amount of car owners, I chose who my interviewee would be very carefully. ^{Expert} had been reviewed to be the best Car Make mechanic in Adelaide, therefore an interview needed to be conducted.

E1 Limitation of information gained from secondary sources recognised and related to research question.

E1 Realisation that further processes were needed in collection of primary information.

E1 Discussion of the research processes used and how this affected the selection of subsequent step of seeking out a primary source to interview.

E2 Challenge identified in terms of the limitation of a research process. This leads to description of steps undertaken to overcome the difficulty.

Evaluation of Decisions Made

What I had regretted the most was not contacting a Japanese car mechanic earlier than I thought to. As I discovered the difference between European and Japanese car owners, I knew that I should have contacted another mechanic earlier that I had. Once I did not receive an email reply from ^{Company}, I then contacted them via mobile phone. The head mechanic apologised that he could not return my email, as he has been flat out, however he would have been glad to partake in my research if he was notified a lot earlier. In terms of how I approached the research processes of interviewing and surveying, I would re-asses the questions I asked and who I asked to participate. However the answers that I had received was highly appropriate in answering my research question, I would have collected more surveys from a larger variations of car enthusiasts. Distributing the survey was the easy part, however looking back it my processes; I should have contacted an Australian car club and asked for some members to partake in a survey.

E2 Assessment of what could have been done to improve processes, e.g. widening the survey.

I believe that this would have been an effective source of information, as it adds another owner's perspective on what the car/owner relationship really means. Having both a European car owner's opinion and a Japanese car owner's idea incorporated into my development was a useful comparison indeed. Although, having that third opinion would have allowed me to analyse and synthesis a greater deal of information, allowing me to make more connections resulting in a more effective research outcome.

E2 Some evaluation, but mostly description of how limitations of research processes became a challenge. Issue identified too late and reported in terms of what could have been done.

Challenges and Opportunities

A challenge that I had made was to not only interview a European car mechanic, but I also should have attempted to interview a Japanese Car mechanic. I believed this because I later found out in my surveys that European car owners have a slightly different opinion on the car/owner relationship than Japanese car owners. I discovered that people, who own European cars, such as ^{Expert} and a few survey participants, seem to mainly focus on the maintenance bond of a vehicle, as opposed to Japanese car owners who focus on the trust and respect side of the car/owner relationship. When I had made this discovery, it was too late to organise an interview with any other mechanic as my emails did not spark a reply and I had just finished synthesising what I had discovering in my four chosen research processes.

E3 The quality of the research outcome is evaluated in terms of the quality of the information gathered and sources used. Whilst happy with information gathered, further research was required.

Quality of Research Outcome

In turn, I am not overall satisfied with the research outcome that I was able to produce, however I am satisfied with the quality of information I had sourced through my research processes. If I had gathered information on Australian car owners and their relationship with their cars, it would have offered a third opinion on the car/owner relationship which would have represented a much greater sample of car owners.

In terms of the type of secondary sources I gathered, I would have asked questions myself on various car forums which would have sparked a greater deal of evidence for my research development. However, just as the idea of asking Australian car owner their idea of a car/owner relationship was a late idea, as was this. The value of what I had discovered through secondary sources, in my opinion, could have been to a greater extent and depth. However, as I stated earlier, the car/owner relationship is a unique thing and is not broadcasted as commonly as the next topic. In regards to what I had discovered in my primary source based research processes, I feel as if it was highly appropriate to answering my research question. The quality of answers provided by both ^{Expert} and survey participants offered a wide variety of paths to explore within my development. In terms of the outcome of my research question, it is safe to say that I agree with that my evidence had leaded me to conclude with. In saying that, I had a slight suspicion that I would arrive to a similar outcome as to this, being that the relationship between a car and its owner must be experienced to be recognised.

E3 Attempt to explain how the evidence from research led to the key finding. As well, there is an attempt to explain that the outcome was what had been expected, thus proving a pre-held belief.

This interestingly brings me to another concluding theory. As I stated earlier, the quality of secondary sources that I had discovered was inevitably close to useless, apart from substantiating a very basic understanding of car/owner relationships. Perhaps, a link can be made between my research outcome and the quality of secondary sources available. All the evidence that I had synthesised within my research development lead me to conclude that the relationship between a car and its owner is something that must be experienced to be recognised. When comparing ^{Expert} interview answers and various car enthusiasts survey answers with information I had found from website blogs, there a significant difference in terms of quality. Since the “car-people” who had provided me with answers had experienced this relationship before, the quality of information is expected to be substantially higher than that of any website blog included in my research development. Therefore what can also be concluded from my research processes and their quality highlights that, to obtain accurate evidence of such a unique relationship such as a car and its owner, information must be sourced from primary beings, as these people are known experienced the bond before. In comparison with a website editor attempting to explain something he/she has not experienced before, the quality of information is on a whole different level.

E3
The issues with quality of the outcome, related to the secondary sources is raised.

E3
Evaluation of the outcome is through the quality of the sources and the information.

Additional Comments

- E1 B** Considered evaluation of research processes used is evident. The processes used which included interviews, surveys and secondary sources, are discussed with reference to usefulness, validity and reliability. Decisions about processes are clearly stated. Some recount but mostly to explain why decisions were made.
- E1 C** Comments are mainly about the decisions made rather than in terms of challenges and opportunities. Elements of decisions made in response to research findings can be found. Challenges and opportunities are at times identified in terms of what could have been done, rather than what was actually done.
- E3 C** Evaluation of the research outcome focusses on the quality of some of the findings. Further research into a third type of car owner is identified as a means to improve the quality of the outcome. The quality of the research question is identified as an inhibiting factor in the research.
- S3 C** Overall the main ideas are mostly clearly expressed. Some discussion lacks coherency as a result of contradictory points, ambiguity or awkwardness in expression. The same examples to illustrate ideas, processes and further directions are repeated in different contexts, affecting the overall depth of discussion.

C+
18

Performance Standards for Stage 2 Research Project B

	<i>Planning</i>	<i>Development</i>	<i>Synthesis</i>	<i>Evaluation</i>
	Assessment Type 1: Folio		Assessment Type 2: Research Outcome	
	Assessment Type 3: Evaluation			
A	<p>P1 Thorough consideration and refinement of a research question.</p> <p>P2 Thorough planning of research processes that are highly appropriate to the research question.</p>	<p><i>D1 Thorough and highly resourceful development of the research.</i></p> <p><i>D2 In-depth analysis of information and exploration of ideas to develop the research.</i></p> <p><i>D3 Highly effective development of knowledge and skills specific to the research question.</i></p> <p><i>D4 Thorough and informed understanding and development of one or more capabilities.</i></p>	<p>S1 Insightful synthesis of knowledge, skills, and ideas to produce a resolution to the research question.</p> <p>S2 Insightful and thorough substantiation of key findings relevant to the research outcome.</p> <p>S3 Clear and coherent expression of ideas.</p>	<p>E1 Insightful evaluation of the research processes used, specific to the research question.</p> <p>E2 Critical evaluation of decisions made in response to challenges and/or opportunities specific to the research processes used.</p> <p>E3 Insightful evaluation of the quality of the research outcome</p>
B	<p>P1 Consideration and some refinement of a research question.</p> <p>P2 Considered planning of research processes that are appropriate to the research question.</p>	<p>D1 Considered and mostly resourceful development of the research.</p> <p>D2 Some complexity in analysis of information and exploration of ideas to develop the research.</p> <p>D3 Effective development of knowledge and skills specific to the research question.</p> <p>D4 Informed understanding and development of one or more capabilities.</p>	<p>S1 Considered synthesis of knowledge, skills, and ideas to produce a resolution to the research question.</p> <p>S2 Substantiation of most key findings relevant to the research outcome.</p> <p>S3 Mostly clear and coherent expression of ideas.</p>	<p>E1 Considered evaluation of the research processes used, specific to the research question.</p> <p>E2 Some complexity in evaluation of decisions made in response to challenges and/or opportunities specific to the research processes used.</p> <p>E3 Considered evaluation of the quality of the research outcome</p>
C	<p>P1 Some consideration of a research question, but little evidence of refinement.</p> <p>P2 Satisfactory planning of research processes that are appropriate to the research question.</p>	<p>D1 Satisfactory development of the research.</p> <p>D2 Satisfactory analysis of information and exploration of ideas to develop the research.</p> <p>D3 Satisfactory development of knowledge and skills specific to the research question.</p> <p>D4 Satisfactory understanding and development of one or more capabilities.</p>	<p>S1 Satisfactory synthesis of knowledge, skills, and ideas to produce a resolution to the research question.</p> <p>S2 Substantiation of some key findings relevant to the research outcome.</p> <p>S3 Generally clear expression of ideas.</p>	<p>E1 Recount with some evaluation of the research processes used.</p> <p>E2 Some evaluation, with mostly description of decisions made in response to challenges and/or opportunities specific to the research processes used.</p> <p>E3 Satisfactory evaluation of the quality of the research outcome</p>
D	<p>P1 Basic consideration and identification of a broad research question.</p> <p>P2 Partial planning of research processes that may be appropriate to the research question.</p>	<p>D1 Development of some aspects of the research.</p> <p>D2 Collection rather than analysis of information, with some superficial description of an idea to develop the research.</p> <p>D3 Superficial development of some knowledge and skills specific to the research question.</p> <p>D4 Basic understanding and development of one or more capabilities</p>	<p>S1 Basic use of information and ideas to produce a resolution to the research question.</p> <p>S2 Basic explanation of ideas related to the research outcome.</p> <p>S3 Basic expression of ideas.</p>	<p>E1 Superficial description of the research processes used.</p> <p>E2 Basic description of decisions made in response to challenges and/or opportunities specific to the research processes used.</p> <p>E3 Superficial evaluation of the quality of the research outcome</p>
E	<p>P1 Attempted consideration and identification of an area for research.</p> <p>P2 Attempted planning of an aspect of the research process.</p>	<p>D1 Attempted development of an aspect of the research.</p> <p>D2 Attempted collection of basic information, with some partial description of an idea.</p> <p>D3 Attempted development of one or more skills that may be related to the research question.</p> <p>D4 Attempted understanding and development of one or more capabilities.</p>	<p>S1 Attempted use of an idea to produce a resolution to the research question.</p> <p>S2 Limited explanation of an idea or an aspect of the research outcome.</p> <p>S3 Attempted expression of ideas.</p>	<p>E1 Attempted description of the research process used.</p> <p>E2 Attempted description of decisions made in response to a challenge and/or opportunity specific to the research processes used.</p> <p>E3 Attempted evaluation of the quality of the research outcome</p>