| **VCE Extended Investigation 2025: Unit 4 Outcomes 1– 2****Externally-assessed Task PART 1: WRITTEN REPORT**  |
| --- |
|  | **Levels of Performance** |
|  | **Not shown** | **1–2 (very low)** | **3–4 (low)** | **5–6 (medium)** | **7–8 (high)** | **9–10 (very high)** |
| **1. Exploration of the research area** |  | Limited knowledge and understanding of general research area and key concepts. | Some knowledge and understanding of the research area and key concepts. | General knowledge and understanding of the research area, identifying key concepts. | Detailed knowledge and thorough understanding of the research area, explaining key concepts. | Extensive knowledge and highly developed understanding of the research area, explaining and applying key concepts. |
| Little use of research literature. | Some use of research literature. | Effective use of research literature. | Extensive engagement with research literature. | Extensive and critical engagement with research literature. |
| **2. Critical engagement with arguments and evidence** |  | Little analysis or evaluation of the arguments and evidence found in the research. | Some analysis and evaluation of arguments and evidence found in the research. | Adequate analysis and evaluation of arguments and evidence found in the research. | Detailed analysis and evaluation of the arguments and evidence found in the research. | Critical analysis and evaluation of arguments and evidence found in the field of research. |
| Tenuous connection between the research reviewed and the question. | Analysis has limited relevance to the research question. | Analysis has clear relevance to the research question.  | Plausible connection between the analysis and the research question. | Strong connection between the analysis and the research question. |
| **3. Research question and methods** |  | Poorly formulated research question with unclear research aims. | Broadly expressed research question with limited direction for research. | Broadly expressed research question indicating clear direction for research. | Focused research question with well-defined scope and clear research intention. | Highly focused and well- articulated research question and direction for investigation. |
| Limited discussion of the methods selected and used in the investigation, reflecting limited understanding of methods or their use. | Some strategy for investigating the research question but little discussion of methods. | Clear and plausible approach to the investigation, with adequate discussion of the methods used. | Detailed discussion of investigative approach, with sound reasoning for the selection of methods.  | Highly focused and considered investigative approach including comprehensive discussion of the methods used. |
| **4. Findings, conclusions and evaluation** |  | Very little synthesis of the findings to address the research question. | Limited synthesis of the findings to address the research question. | Adequate synthesis of the findings to address the research question. | Effective synthesis of the findings to address the research question. | Sophisticated synthesis of the findings to address the research question. |
| Limited use of relevant data as evidence. | Some relevant data used as evidence. | Mostly relevant data used as evidence. | Relevant data used as evidence. | Relevant and well analysed data used as evidence. |
| Limited indication of conclusions or reflection on their value. | Some conclusions drawn from the findings, with little comment on their value. | Clear and largely substantiated conclusions based on the findings, with some evaluative comment. | Well reasoned, substantiated conclusions based on the findings, with some evaluative comment. | Well reasoned, comprehensively substantiated conclusions based on the findings, with reflection on the value of the investigation. |
| **5. Clarity, precision and coherence** |  | Limited use of terminology relevant to the research area. | Consistent use of some terminology relevant to the research area. | Clear, consistent use of terminology relevant to the research area generally. | Clear, consistent use of terminology specific and relevant to the investigation. | Precise use of terminology specific and relevant to the investigation. |
| Limited clarity or coherence in presenting or interpreting data, or in drawing conclusions. | Some data clearly presented and discussed, limited clarity or coherence in reasoning. | Data generally clearly presented and discussed, generally sound reasoning for the findings and conclusions. | Data is clearly presented and discussed, and coherently linked to findings and conclusions. | Data is well presented and strongly linked by sound reasoning to the question, findings and conclusions. |
| **6. Style, structure and observance of academic conventions** |  | Little organisation or structure in expressing ideas. | Some organisation of ideas in an appropriate reporting structure. | Ideas are organised and expressed in appropriate academic style and structure. | Well organised presentation and expression of ideas, in appropriate academic style and structure. | Effective use of academic reporting style and structure in the organisation and expression of ideas. |
| Limited success in adapting content for non-specialist readers. | Some adaptation of content for non-specialist readers. | Content is generally clear and coherent to non-specialist readers. | Content is well adapted for clarity and accessibility for non-specialist readers, without loss of precision. | Content is made clear and accessible to non-specialist readers, without loss of necessary complexity or precision. |
| Little or flawed use of academic citations, attributions or bibliographic details. | Little appropriate use of academic citations, attributions or bibliographic details. | Satisfactory use of academic citations, attributions and bibliographic details. | Consistent and complete use of academic citations, attributions and bibliographic details. | Proficient and comprehensive use of academic citations, attributions and bibliographic details. |