# Government of South Australia LogoSACE Board Logo2022 Society and Culture Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2022 assessment cycle, gives an overview of how students performed in their school and external assessments in relation to the learning requirements, assessment design criteria, and performance standards set out in the relevant subject outline. They provide information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

Teachers should refer to the subject outline for specifications on content and learning requirements, and to the subject operational information for operational matters and key dates.

Across the Assessment Types for this subject, students can present their responses in oral or multimodal form, where 6 minutes is the equivalent of 1000 words. Students **should not speed-up the recording** of their videos excessively **in an attempt to condense more content** into the maximum time limit.

From 2023, if a video is flagged by markers/moderators as impacted by speed, **schools will be requested to provide a transcript** and markers/moderators will be advised to mark/moderate based on the evidence in the transcript, only considering evidence up to the maximum word limit (e.g. up to 2000 words for AT3).

If the speed of the recording makes the speech incomprehensible, it affects the accuracy of transcriptions and it also impacts the ability of markers/moderators to find evidence of student achievement against the performance standards.

# School Assessment

Teachers can improve the moderation process and the online process by:

* thoroughly checking that all grades entered in school online are correct.
* ensuring the uploaded tasks are legible, all facing up (and all the same way), and remove blank pages, student notes.
* ensuring the uploaded responses have pages the same size and in colour so teacher marking and comments are clear.
* ensuring assignments where there has been collaboration, students being assessed are clearly identified.
* ensuring tasks are clearly labelled and match the wording used in the Learning and Assessment Plan.
* ensuing LAP details Covid adjustments.
* providing VMM statement when full sample of assessment tasks were not included.

Assessment Type 1: Folio (50%)

For a 10-credit subject, students undertake two assessments for the folio, at least one of which should be an oral activity.

For a 20-credit subject, students undertake at least three assessments for the folio, with at least one assessment for each of the three topics studied.

This assessment type may be undertaken by students as individuals, in groups, or as members of a whole class. A folio assessment should be a maximum of 1500 words if written or a maximum of 7 minutes for an oral presentation, or the equivalent in multimodal form.

Generally, a wide variety of quality tasks were set by teachers. Many dealt with relevant issues concerning mental health, privacy in a digital age, the influence of “fake news”, and our environmental footprint.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* being mindful of the overuse of scaffolding leading to similar responses across the whole class of students.
* ensuring task design provides students with the opportunity to achieve against the highest performance standards.
* revisiting in-class instruction to ensure that KU1 and AI2 are being met across the board.
* ensuring topics align with the specified topics in the subject outline.
* ensuring that issues are of a contemporary nature and aligned with the subject outline.
* giving students the choice of a variety of modes of assessment to demonstrate their learning.

*The more successful responses commonly:*

* Used analytical and sophisticated language which allowed students to clearly articulate the contemporary nature of the topics chosen. This included a level of depth in the use of primary sources (either interviews or surveys) to support secondary sources (strong synthesis).
* Contained explicit and clear analysis of issues and their connection to the wider society.
* Demonstrated multiple viewpoints of the issue being discussed
* Examined the interactions between different groups within societies and the interconnections between different societies and cultures.
* Analysed in-depth the specific features of the criteria being assessed. This was enhanced by tasks which were set by teachers to deliberately address these features (for example, KU2 social change).
* Used subject-specific vocabulary/terminologies e.g. power structures, social change.
* Used a wide variety of both primary & secondary sources, coupled with insightful analysis and evaluation of these sources.
* Engaged with sources and used a variety of sources to make a point.
* Correctly and consistently referenced a wide variety of relevant primary and secondary sources which were also included in a comprehensive bibliography.
* Focused on current social issues. Topics chosen were timely to social change.
* Identified and understood the nature and causes of social change relating to contemporary issues and how this affected the experiences of multiple generations.
* Analysed current news and laws which were relevant to the topic.
* Clearly addressed social change and power structures in tasks that assessed these performance standards.
* Articulated power structures and its influence on social issues which were detailed and showed excellent comparison and analysis.
* Had clear and explicit analysis of issues and their connection to society.
* Identified and understood the nature and causes of social change in relation to contemporary issues and recognised similarities and differences over time (e.g. consideration of the experiences of different generations).
* Used terminologies such as interdependence, power structures and social change to demonstrate understanding.
* Well organised assessments with clear subheadings, including captions and graphics to further articulate ideas to enhance the quality of their communication.
* Undertook a variety of tasks in a range of modes to demonstrate knowledge and understanding in creative ways (e.g. oral presentations, videos, photos).
* Unpacked and used evidence effectively which was discussed in the student assessment, rather than just included.
* Had a clear purpose and well-defined boundaries/outcomes allowing for more insightful and in-depth analysis.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* Lacked analysis or consideration of the positives and negatives of issues discussed. Tended to have students’ list facts rather than engage with the topic or question of the task.
* Recounted findings rather than analysed or evaluated.
* Focused more on description than analysis and did not draw conclusions about the issue.
* Repeated ideas without adding, analysing, or evaluating.
* Relied on personal experiences or viewpoints rather than analysing well-substantiated research from experts and primary sources to inform opinions and draw conclusions.
* Used minimal or easy to access information, often from outdated or irrelevant sources.
* Relied on information from easily accessible interviewees without considering their credentials, or surveyed their peers without considering their suitability.
* Inadequately acknowledged sources by omitting or incorrectly referencing, and/or not providing a comprehensive bibliography
* Relied on too few sources of information, often only secondary sources.
* Lacked sophisticated language.
* Focused too much on the 'what happened/is happening’ and less on evaluation
* Limited understanding of power structures and how they operate.
* Required students to research historical events, or social issues that did not involve change or the exploration and discovery of new ideas.
* Had incomplete tasks.

Assessment Type 2: Interaction (20%)

For a 10-credit subject, students undertake one assessment for the interaction: a group activity.

For a 20-credit subject, students undertake at least two assessments for the interaction, at least one of which is a group activity and at least one of which is an oral activity.

Overall, a much-improved quality and quantity of evidence for these assessment tasks was provided by teachers, especially in providing evidence of social actions undertaken.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* not providing too much pointless documentation of evidence of collaboration - some social interaction assessments were 90 pages long - students submitted all of group’s evidence and work - should only submit their own reflection/evaluation so it is clear whose evaluation to assess.
* making it clear in the social action group task, which students wrote/completed what, to ensure clear moderation.

*The more successful responses commonly:*

* undertook a Social Action that had a clearly stated purpose and meaningful impact that was linked to their analysis of the social issue, and in the reflection/ evaluation students used examples of what worked and what did not and then students evaluated this in terms of it being a positive/ negative.
* demonstrated collaboration for the Group task that was clear, highlighting the role each student made for assessment purposes.
* provided a folio of evidence that clearly identified the contributions of each group member (e.g. record sheets, journals, notes, transcripts of collaborative group evaluations, de-brief, good quality recordings of round table discussions).
* included an exploration of the impact of their social action.
* was able to provide evidence of knowledge and understanding based on a significant amount of research on a relevant social issue.
* demonstrated substantial evidence of knowledge and understanding based on research into a relevant social issue
* enabled student choice and creativity but still provided structure to meet power structures/ social change performance standards for an oral activity.
* Had oral activities that were engaging for students and the contemporary nature of the issues came through strongly.
* presented oral assessment which included a good quality film and/or oral recording of student speaking, not just a script which included referencing and bibliography.
* demonstrated their knowledge and understanding of the topic (e.g. included a report of their research findings to justify their social action).

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* provided PowerPoint and no audio/video.
* displayed limited social actions to a comfortable/familiar audience.
* based on personal opinion, rather than backed up with evidence from a wide variety of primary & secondary sources.
* lacked depth in research.
* did not analyse or annotate the reason for including evidence in the Social Action, it was just put in the task.
* recounted what the group did rather than evaluating.
* contained a recount of their social action and reflection on their contributions.
* lack of contribution to the social action tasks.
* did not make clear the student's involvement in the collaboration of the group task, and individual contributions were unclear.
* did not carry out the proposed social action for the group task.
* were unrealistic in what could be achieved for the social action by the group.
* Had no video/audio evidence of oral presentations.
* lacked any referencing and/or bibliography.
* restricted social action to a simple task for which it was difficult to measure the impact (e.g. constructing a poster, performing a role play).
* contained basic analysis that restricted students from demonstrating achievement in the Investigation and Analysis and Knowledge and Understanding criteria.
* took the form of a PowerPoint presentation to an unspecified audience, limiting the opportunity to evaluate its impact on a target audience or audiences.

# External Assessment

The standard seemed to be high overall as the investigations were well researched, met the subject criteria and were interesting.

The range of topics was excellent, and the research methods were impressive, especially given the limitations on face-to-face contact. Most students showed the ability to gather and understand information and process it meaningfully. Responses from students demonstrated a mastery of the subject matter. Overall, the investigations were of a good standard with interesting local topics where students were able to gather primary first-hand information and analyse it well (e.g. Stigma of Mental Health and Plastic Pollution). The investigations were generally pertinent, thorough, using thoughtful approaches with a clear structure and varied sources.

Additionally, the investigations displayed student engagement with their subject and chosen topics. The students were competent researchers and able to effectively discern relevance. Most had chosen topics wisely in that they were interested in their choice and information was available. Most students followed the recommended outlines for research. They clearly stated their topic, established some guiding questions, discussed their findings critically, and presented a conclusion along with some comments on the possible shortcomings and/or strengths of their investigation. They differentiated between primary and secondary research and understood the need for both. In the writing the best submissions used the statement/example followed by an evaluating comment format effectively. They understood that the Investigation is exactly that, an investigation and not a summary of research, or an argument for an already established point-of-view.

The best questions were nuanced and impartial, so allowing for genuine investigation. They were also targeted. The best questions were “small”, but not too small and not unimportant. The more successful students realized they were not being asked to explain or justify their attitudes but rather to discuss, analyse and evaluate their research.

The range of chosen subjects was impressive. Social media topics were popular, particularly how the various platforms influenced mental health, the promotion of misogyny and bullying. There were some more technology-oriented subjects, including anthropomorphism in robots, and whether car fuel systems influenced buyers. Some important social issues proved as interesting as ever, the effects of domestic violence on children, sleep patterns in teenagers, beauty standards and their links to mental health. Racism was again important, and at times investigated in a subtle way, for example in the form of colourism and cultural appropriation in hip-hop music. Some topics were more theoretical, as in the role of conflict in social change. Generally most students did better with more practical and local questions with the possibility of using local sources.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* ensuring that student work is anonymised for impartiality.
* teachers are strongly advised to not include marking, feedback, or rubrics in student work samples.
* ensure that students adhere to word count.
* reminding students that the inclusion of communication with primary sources and analysis of secondary sources (in appendices) is not required in the Investigation.

Assessment Type 3: Investigation

*The more successful responses commonly:*

* chose a topic that was of interest to them - this allowed them to delve more deeply and thoroughly into the topic, presenting a range of perspectives.
* investigated genuine social issues currently under debate, not issues which had a primary focus on economic, historical, or legal issues.
* had a clearly defined purpose with appropriate guiding or focusing questions to structure the investigation.
* set clear boundaries to the investigation so that the issue could be analysed in depth.
* synthesised information from relevant expert sources, including primary data from surveys or interviews.
* directly addressed social change.
* recognised/acknowledged bias and limitations of the investigation.
* had a carefully chosen and carefully worded question/hypothesis supported by guiding questions pointing to aspects of the topic
* showed the student had the ability to collect and summarize a wealth of material from both primary and secondary sources.
* identified an awareness of the forces for and against social change.
* showed the ability to acknowledge and discuss unexpected findings.
* used sophisticated language (for example, conjunctions like although, despite, etc) to assist with the analysis of the source material.
* consistently acknowledged sources – via referencing and a Bibliography.
* researched a topic within the parameters of the Performance Standards.
* used a variety of primary and/or secondary sources that were directly linked to the context of the investigation e.g. using Australian sources to discuss Australian issues (EC1).
* cross-referenced ideas between different authors and discussed these explicitly, highlighting conjecture within current social and cultural issues (EC1, EC2).
* used appropriate terminology when discussing different social and cultural groups of people e.g. First Nations Peoples, Romani Peoples, people with an intellectual disability etc. (KU1, EC2).
* communicated findings through using graphs, tables and images (where appropriate), which were integrated into the overall discussion fluently (EC2).
* explored possible solutions to local social and cultural issues by evaluating other local or global projects (IA1).
* engaged with and evaluated successful and unsuccessful political and governmental responses to current social issues (KU2, IA1).
* had a well-constructed question. Students structured their report with a clear hypothesis and introduction.
* answered relevant sub-topics which gave the student’s investigation a clear direction and resolution.
* used appropriate primary sources and credible, contemporary secondary sources
* reflected well on a chosen contemporary social or cultural topic and offered recommendations in the conclusion.
* used a range of strategies to structure the investigation clearly and logically (e.g. guiding questions, hypotheses, appropriate headings and topic sentences).
* used relevant experts as primary sources and integrated quotes from primary sources and interviews fluently within the discussion.
* analysed and evaluated various perspectives on their chosen issue rather than summarising collected information from secondary sources.
* cross-referenced primary and secondary sources with one another and synthesised information.
* explicitly pointed out the local context of an issue, as well as the broader state, national or international aspects.
* showed a good understanding of the mechanisms of change and the implications (KU2) and demonstrated effective use of reliable, valid and relevant sources, and contrasting opinions (EC1).
* synthesised the material to provide their authentic voice rather than a compilation of other’s opinions.
* presented or summarised research findings and discussed the findings, showing an ability to pick up on differences in opinion, unexpected results and/or gaps in the research.
* approached the chosen topic with an open mind and were prepared to discuss and accept unexpected findings.
* reflected on their research and evaluated its effectiveness as well as the usefulness of their sources and suggested alternative approaches and sources as well as possible future action.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* lacked clear direction, investigating a topic which was too broad in scope or of a general nature.
* were simply explanations or descriptions of a topic, rather than an analysis of the issue.
* summarised results of surveys rather than highlighting significant results and integrating them into the analysis.
* used “dot” points that did not allow for adequate explanation/discussion.
* included diagrams, graphs, and statistics without commenting on their significance or relevance.
* summarised various sources of information separately without synthesising or connecting ideas.
* presented a biased investigation or intruded personal views without acknowledgement of such.
* showed a choice of topics that were too big, too remote or lead to pre-judged conclusions.
* provided a summary of the research rather than a discussion, that is, presented the “whats” rather than hunting for the “whys”.
* started well but showed signs of running out of time so were too short or had rushed conclusions.
* did not provide acknowledged sources by omitting or incorrectly referencing, and/or not providing a comprehensive bibliography.
* chose a topic which the student was unable to write a perceptive response.
* lacked insightful analysis of the nature and causes of social change.
* limited use of sources and reliance on easily accessible (on occasion no primary sources).
* used evidence from primary sources that were not linked to the issue selected.
* used graphics and graphs for decorative purposes, rather than including figures that were integrated into the discussion (EC2).
* used American, British and Australian sources interchangeably, without acknowledging the different contexts, particularly for statistics (EC1).
* used generic definitions for key terms from dictionaries that were not adequate for academic discussion (EC1 & EC2).
* did not have an Investigation question or hypothesis.
* consisted of a scientific investigation without any consideration of social change or social impact.
* were a recount of an event, without any context of its contemporary nature.
* relied too heavily on description and recounted findings rather than analysis.
* spent too much word count describing the research methodology.
* had broad or generic questions lacking in a clearly defined purpose that became a challenge to answer in 2000 words or explore them locally, nationally and/or internationally.
* focused on ‘the what’ and definitions of terminology which at times used inappropriate or dated terminology. At times key definitions were gathered from simple sources that undermined the entire investigation. For example a dictionary website, Wikipedia.
* did not adequately address the assessment design criteria, especially social change (e.g. topic selected were more suited to Health and Psychology investigations with little references to social or cultural issues).
* relied heavily on personal experience and opinion and lacked expert primary sources.
* used primary data that was irrelevant to the discussion or the line of inquiry, or was from an inexpert source (e.g. interviewing friends or surveying the class).
* did not evaluate different sources and opinions (EC1).
* provided responses that were too biased to one perspective and lacking thorough analysis of the different parts of the issue.
* selected topics with a preconceived idea about the answer and therefore overlooked a range of perspectives and sources leading to a biased report.
* used readily available, but not always reliable, online sources without questioning its authenticity.