Psychology

2011 Assessment Report

Government of South Australia

SACE Board of SA

PSYCHOLOGY
2011 ASSESSMENT REPORT

OVERVIEW

Assessment reports give an overview of how students performed in 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, the quality of student performance, and any relevant statistical information.

This is the eighth year in which Psychology has been assessed as a SACE subject. The enrolment numbers decreased from about 2900 in 2010 to 2100 in 2011. Only one school entered a learning and assessment plan for a 10-credit subject.

The mean score for the examination was 57.4%. The table below provides information for the last 3 years.

Year	Enrolment Numbers	Examination Mean (%)
2011	2152	57.4
2010	2869	60.2
2009	2687	51.2

2011 was the first year of implementation of the new SACE, which requires schools to submit samples of skills and applications tasks for moderation. The quality assurance of the other two assessment types (investigations folio and examination) remained consistent with previous years despite reference to new assessment design criteria and performance standards.

Overall achievement in the subject remained consistent with previous years: approximately 18% in the A band, 41% in the B band, and 30% in the C band.

Teachers have achieved a significant shift in their assessment practices in 2011 while still allowing students to show their capability within this subject.

Psychology remains a very accessible and important subject for scientific and mental health literacy within our secondary education.

SCHOOL ASSESSMENT

The school assessment types were centrally moderated, according to the SACE Board's requirements, policies, and procedures. Schools submitted the sets of evidence requested by the SACE Board. This assisted the moderation panel in validating and confirming teachers' assessment decisions about students' learning.

Moderation helps to ensure fairness to students and to provide the wider community with reliable information about student performance. Moderators are trained teachers and academics. Pairs of moderators viewed the sets of evidence within the assessment types and across a number of grade levels. The pairing of moderators was changed on a regular basis so that the standards set during the training period were consistent during the moderation period.

While adjustments were made during the moderation process across both assessment types, the assessment of the sets of student evidence in the skills and application tasks was confirmed against the performance standards more

consistently than in the investigations folio. This indicates that, in general, teachers are providing valid assessment tasks and judging student performance with greater accuracy within this assessment type.

Approximately half of the classes had some grade levels changed during moderation. Where grade levels were lowered, it was usually as a result of overgenerous marking within the A and B grade bands in the investigations folio. Where grade levels were increased, students had been able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of a general or limited range of psychological concepts. These changes were made mostly in the D and E grade bands.

Assessment Type 1: Investigations Folio

After 8 years of currency, the investigations folio has become the mainstay of evidence-based research in Psychology. Supporting material is widely available and teachers' understanding of the tasks involved has matured. Teachers in their early years of delivering this subject should seek out the support and guidance of experienced teachers in the community. For example, teachers should ensure that they are using Board-approved research programs and following the guidelines and procedures carefully to allow students to demonstrate their investigative, analytical, and evaluation skills.

Extensive literature review and information-based research are discouraged because the subject outline specifies that in the Investigations Folio 'students inquire into aspects of psychology through *practical* discovery and data analysis.' Students should see the investigations folio as an opportunity to collect and analyse data, form conclusions about that data, and evaluate their procedures. When they do this, they experience first-hand research with all its strengths and flaws and understand what it means to 'know' something in Psychology.

Investigation reports were typically presented with the headings Introduction, Results, and Discussion. There is no need for a method section as it is not a requirement of the subject outline and it is not assessed. Students who were able to demonstrate evidence of their learning at the A level did not complete a method section and used their discussion for analysis and evaluation. Extensive scaffolding and use of templates of reports are discouraged as they do not necessarily allow students to demonstrate perceptive analytical skills.

On the whole, report introductions were extremely brief and did not allow students to demonstrate performance against the Investigation criterion. Students who wrote good introductions were able to present the premise of their investigation and how the data they selected would be analysed to form a conclusion about their research question. Where students undertook a literature review in the introduction, they were not able to evaluate their research in the discussion effectively within the 1500-word limit. Teachers are discouraged from using the investigations folio to address assessment design criterion I2 in any depth (Critical selection and acknowledgment of information about psychology and issues in psychology from different sources). This was handled more effectively when students approached it in a skills and applications task.

Under the Results heading, students are discouraged from overusing tables and graphs and from mixing data types (i.e. qualitative and quantitative data). Students who presented many graphs/tables were not able to interpret them adequately within the word-limit. Only graphs/tables relevant to the hypothesis/research question are necessary, and each should be discussed later in the report. Students should not present raw data in the results section of the report unless it is relevant to the data analysis (i.e. for graphs of correlation).

The Discussion typically consists of three elements:

- analysis of the result evident in students' data
- evaluation of the procedures used
- a conclusion about the evidence presented.

In the A and B grade bands, students need to show higher levels of evaluation of procedures rather than data. To enable students to demonstrate analysis and evaluation at the A level, they should be encouraged to evaluate investigation design, procedures, and ethics, in the specific terms of the research program they are conducting rather than in generic terms. For example, students may evaluate the validity and reliability of the procedures used to collect data on heart rates, rather than saying that they did not think the heart rates they recorded were suitable to support a particular hypothesis.

Concluding statements only need to recap the major finding from the investigation (i.e. what the student concluded from his/her investigation). Students are reminded that, to achieve the higher grade bands, they should include improvements to the design of the investigations along with the strengths and weaknesses of the design and the quality of the data.

Assessment Type 2: Skills and Applications Tasks

The skills and application tasks mainly consisted of tests and internal examinations with one or two assignments. The majority of the student evidence was written, although a minority produced oral presentations on DVD/CD.

Student evidence of learning was confirmed more consistently within this assessment type than in the investigations folio. Teachers' assessment decisions were more accurate when tests were used, although the student cohort and context should be considered when a learning and assessment plan is being developed, as some students could have more effectively demonstrated their learning with alternative modes of communication.

Teachers are reminded to address each of the four assessment design criteria across a set of skills and application tasks.

The design of tasks was the most common reason for the adjustment of grade levels, where students were achieving A levels in their tasks only against the Knowledge and Understanding criterion. Teachers should ensure that students have the opportunity to demonstrate analysis and evaluation, for example, through the use of scenarios, film reviews, or questions that allow them to provide examples to demonstrate their knowledge as well as their ability to apply, analyse, and evaluate. Where this was not evident, the students were not able to achieve an A standard.

The application of performance standards was used to determine the teacher's assessment decision. In addition, marks were widely used and these provided additional information for the moderators.

Teachers are advised to set reasonable word-limits in this assessment type (i.e. between 1000 and 1500 words). Longer pieces of work did not necessarily attract higher levels of achievement and in most cases resulted in student work that lacked clarity and discernment in the presentation of information.

EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT

Assessment Type 3: Examination

The examination is composed of two sections: short-answer questions worth 80 marks and extended-response questions worth 40 marks. The examination is divided into six topic headings and also includes questions on ethical issues and the four levels of explanation of behaviour used in psychology.

The examination was marked out of 120 marks, using established conventions for marking, and the setting of the examination conformed to specifications in the 2011 subject outline and Sciences 2011 Learning Area Manual.

The mean marks for each topic, ethics and four levels are shown in the following table.

Topic	**Mean mark % 2011**	Mean mark % 2010
Introduction to Psychology	**67.67**	66.91
Social Cognition	**71.02**	71.14
Learning	**56.44**	56.27
Personality	**46.95**	55.35
Psychobiology of Altered States of Awareness	**51.02**	56.56
Healthy Minds	**57.99**	54.55
Ethical Issues	**74.67**	45.18
Four Levels of Explanation of Behaviour	**53.91**	56.56

Average marks in each section show that this year's cohort could demonstrate evidence of learning in all aspects of the course.

In terms of specific content areas, Personality had the lowest mean. Personality was tested in the short-answer section this year and students found questions 14 and 15 most challenging.

Students understand ethical issues less well when the issues are applied outside the context of human research. Teachers should explicitly cover aspects of ethical issues in each of the six content areas so that students may appreciate the ethical issues in the application of psychological principles. In particular, students should demonstrate knowledge of the ethical use of animals in research and the ethical treatment of patients in the clinical setting.

Section A: Short-answer Questions

In general, 2 marks are allocated for one well-expressed idea or piece of information. Questions that require a detailed explanation are usually worth 4 marks and, therefore, in order to obtain full marks, students must supply two relevant and connected pieces of information. Students need to be mindful not to use the wording of the question as if it was an answer in itself.

The short-answer questions varied in difficulty from those that required straightforward, easily reproduced knowledge through to those that required skills of critical understanding, problem-solving, and/or application of psychological principles.

In general students were able to demonstrate their knowledge using appropriate psychological terminology. Students often lost marks by not understanding the verb used in the question, for example, the difference between 'state', 'describe', and 'explain'. Further, students sometimes gave generic answers when the question asked for a response directly related to the information provided in a scenario. Where questions were divided into parts, students sometimes did not see how the parts were connected and the relevance of each part to the opening scenario. Students should avoid writing irrelevant information that may lead them to answer incorrectly.

Students who performed well provided clear and concise answers directly related to the scenario. The number of lines provided for the answer in the examination paper gives an approximate guide to the average length of response required. Students cannot lose marks for the volume of their response, but it may be useful for them to practice answering within the lines provided, using past examination papers.

Teachers are advised to address these issues during the teaching program so that students are able to use a wider range of examination-answering techniques.

The mean mark for each question in Section A is shown in the table below.

Question	Mean Mark	Maximum Mark	Mean (%)
1	1.89	2	94.55
2	1.28	2	64.09
3	4.17	6	69.57
4	1.83	4	45.75
5	1.80	2	89.77
6	1.69	4	42.29
7	1.54	2	76.93
8	1.63	2	81.50
9	3.44	4	86.05
10	0.98	2	49.12
11	1.35	2	67.43
12	2.26	4	56.56
13	1.61	4	40.27
14	0.45	2	22.57
15	3.86	8	48.20

16	2.22	4	55.54
17	3.69	6	61.51
18	1.99	4	49.85
19	1.83	4	45.84
20	1.68	2	84.25
21	0.69	2	34.58
22	1.23	2	61.63
23	1.67	2	83.66
24	1.84	4	46.12
Section A totals	46.62	80	60.73

Question 1

This question asked students to calculate a mean for a distribution of scores, and virtually all students could demonstrate this ability, making it the question with the highest mean mark in the examination. Of the very few errors made, the most common was incorrect placement of the decimal.

Question 2

Some students confused *objective* and *subjective* quantitative methods. The most common answer was ‘rating scales’, using the Likert scale as an example. Some students simply said ‘questionnaires’ and did not give enough detail about the type of questions asked. This question asked for a description rather than just stating ‘rating scale’ or ‘Likert scale’. Students who understood the concept well were able to articulate why rating scales are numerical and subjective.

Question 3

Question 3 presented students with the results of an experiment. With a mean of almost 70%, most students could demonstrate basic scientific literacy.

In part (a) approximately a quarter of students did not recognise the independent variable. The most common incorrect answer was ‘audiovisual materials’, rather than recognising that the difference between the two groups was the use of visual materials. Students could also simply have answered ‘type of materials used’, which would have been correct.

In part (b) students most often lost marks for identifying rather than describing an advantage of experimental design. The most common correct answer was built on establishing causation between independent and dependent variables. Students who achieved full marks could expand on why elements of an experimental design help to generalise findings or lead to a convincing cause-and-effect relationship.

In part (c) students generally interpreted the graph accurately. Most students answered this part of the question correctly even if they had answered the first two parts of the question incorrectly. Students were able to demonstrate the effect of the independent variable on test performance.

Question 4

In part (a), many students tended to identify a feature of the design, rather than describe the disadvantage of that feature. It was evident that some students did not clearly understand the nature of the research. Some students also wrote about an

advantage instead of a disadvantage. The most common correct answer related to the presence of extraneous variables.

In part (b) students generally answered correctly, even if they answered part 4 (a) incorrectly. A number of students suggested changing the design to experimental to establish causation. This was the most common incorrect answer. In fact, the question asked for one improvement to the existing design, not a completely different design.

Question 5

Almost all students demonstrated clear knowledge and understanding of ethical principles in a focus group setting. The most common answers described confidentiality and the right to withdraw due to the sensitive nature of a focus group topic as relevant ethical issues.

Question 6

Many students described the content analysis process well, although approximately a third of students did not answer the question at all. Many students scored low marks for vaguely discussing that results from investigations need to be analysed, which could apply to both qualitative and quantitative data. Some linked content analysis to analysing results from experiments. The question asked students to describe the content analysis process, and so, those who discussed two well-connected pieces of information within that process scored full marks.

Question 7

Answers to this question had a high accuracy rate. Students identified a factor that influences people's attitude formation, and explained it well in relation to roller coaster rides. The most common answer was 'direct experience, then forming either a positive or negative attitude'. Some incorrect answers mistakenly addressed the question in terms of attitude function.

Question 8

Social comparison is a well-understood concept. Some students simply stated that Patricia would feel better without explaining *how* this would happen. Some students confused the terms 'upward' and 'downward' when discussing social comparison.

Question 9

Most students related their answer to the scenario (i.e. parental consent, self-esteem). Some students gave incorrect answers related to reducing the validity of the investigation (e.g. giving socially desirable answers, rather than an ethical issue).

Question 10

Most students were able to identify behavioural counts or heart rate as a suitable answer for this question. Some students misunderstood the question and described rating scales or standardised IQ or personality tests.

Question 11

Some students complicated their answer by adding 'positive' or 'negative' in front of the word 'punishment'. If the question was not well understood, students who answered 'negative punishment' scored no marks. Many students incorrectly answered with 'negative reinforcement'.

Question 12

Schedules of reinforcement are reasonably well understood, but still many students did not answer this question. Many students incorrectly named and provided an example of positive or negative reinforcement. Some students correctly described a schedule but provided an example of a different schedule. In a question of this nature it is important for students to write clearly and concisely in order to convey their understanding.

Question 13

Answers to this question indicated that behaviour modification is not well understood by the majority of students. Many students gained 2 marks for correctly describing how positive reinforcement or reward could make Wayne attend training sessions more often, but did not describe accurately a behaviour modification program. Punishment was used, often mixed with reinforcement, which demonstrated that students did not fully understand the nature of behaviour modification.

Question 14

This question, relating to the strengths of trait theories of personality, had the lowest mean mark of the examination. Many students described a characteristic or feature of trait theories rather than a specific strength. In some cases, students tended to choose answers relating to humanistic theories instead. Students should be encouraged into deeper critical thinking about the theories they learn, rather than rote learning lists of attributes.

Question 15

This question, about the details of personality tests, proved very difficult for half of the students. In part (a) some students provided information about personality theory rather than providing a description of a personality test. Others provided information about conducting interviews or described an aptitude test. Some merely named a test and the measures it produced, but did not elaborate on how those measures were arrived at.

In part (b) some students provided a definition/explanation of the concept of validity rather than describing a problem associated with the validity of personality tests.

Answers to part (c) commonly described ethical issues relating to research and did not effectively explain how such issues would be relevant to personality tests. There was some confusion between ethical issues and validity issues. Other students answered that they had to be carried out by a psychologist but did not elaborate on why they would not be. Hence it was not clear what ethical issue they were describing.

The main specific features tested in this question were:

A2 Application of appropriate psychological terms.
AE2 Evaluation of procedures, with suggestions for improvement.
KU1 Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of psychological concepts and ethical considerations.

A close reading of the differences in each grade band of the performance standards may help students to recognise what is required and produce answers that will attract higher grades.

Question 16

This question on humanistic theory produced a full range of marks from student responses. A common error was to provide a description, or state some

characteristics, of a humanistic theory of personality, rather than describing how a 'healthy personality' could develop. Some described the process of self-actualisation but did not refer to the terms used in the question: how a 'healthy personality' could develop.

Question 17

Question 17 asked for a description of a psychodynamic theory of personality. Many students listed features of psychodynamic theory rather than describing how the components work together to influence personality. Some provided confusing answers that did not adequately demonstrate a deeper understanding of the theories. Evidently some students can describe elements of the theory but have trouble constructing a longer, cohesive piece of writing with connected information.

Question 18

Students commonly identified protective factors for mental health rather than those that positively influence doctors' resilience. Although there is some overlap between the two, students needed to demonstrate a stable factor or characteristic of a person that leads them to resilience, rather than a statistically favourable factor such as income. Some students stated a factor, but did not describe it.

Question 19

In this question on depression at the sociocultural and basic processes levels, only a quarter of students achieved 3 or 4 marks out of 4.

Part (a) was mostly well done, although it was evident that students confused 'antisocial' behaviour with withdrawal from social interaction.

A common error in part (b) was that students provided a description of a psychological therapy rather than a coping strategy. Some students stated a strategy and did not provide a description of it.

Question 20

Most students correctly identified the biological level of explanation.

Question 21

Many students found this question challenging, partly because the person level of explanation is misunderstood or confused with the basic processes level. Some students believe extroversion is a strength and included it as a protective factor against mental illness.

Question 22

Responses to question 22 again showed that students find it difficult to discern between the basic processes and person levels of explanation. Teachers should provide specific instruction to aid understanding of these two levels.

Question 23

Most students offered a correct answer to this question, with the most common error being symptoms of anxiety that are not observable.

Question 24

In general, students demonstrated that they understood the process of cognitive-behavioural therapy, but did not explain how it relates to a basic processes level.

Section B: Extended-response Questions

Each extended-response question was marked out of 20, with 16 marks allocated for content (each well-expressed idea or piece of information being worth 2 marks) and 4 marks for communication. Questions 25 and 26 had four content parts, each of which was marked out of 4.

The following factors were taken into account when a communication mark was awarded:

- Was the answer clear and well expressed?
- Was the answer well organised?
- Was the answer relevant to the question?

Almost all students offered responses to both question 25 and 26. In general students produced well-structured responses of an appropriate length.

As a general observation, the use of everyday language rather than psychology terms tends to lead to inaccurate answers.

Question 25

Responses to this question about Learning and Social Cognition varied in quality, with a mean of 12.30 marks, or 61.50%.

Dot point one – the principles of classical conditioning

This dot point proved the most challenging for students answering question 25, with few full marks being awarded. The principles of classical conditioning appeared to be confused, with terminology assigned to the incorrect elements of the scenario. The best answers identified the sight of brown dogs as the neutral stimulus, paired with the attack to form the conditioned response of pain/fear. These students were often able to outline acquisition and performance as two separate processes, therefore easily presenting two well-connected ideas about classical conditioning. Some students offered information regarding Pavlov's experiment and, while this was on the same topic, it was not particularly relevant to the question.

Dot point two – stimulus generalisation

Students identified the stimulus generalisation from a brown dog to all dogs but often did not elaborate that the stimuli were similar. The most effective answers outlined the process of stimulus generalisation, illustrating their answer with elements of the scenario. Other students did not mention the original conditioned stimulus being a brown dog. Some students confused stimulus *generalisation* with stimulus *discrimination*. Often, terminology errors led students to write that all dogs were paired with the unconditioned rather than the conditioned stimulus.

Dot point three – the structure of attitudes

Most students were well able to explain the structure of an attitude and to relate this to the scenario, with all correct answers using the ABC or tricomponent model. Some confused the cognitive component with the affective component, and others described the affective component as the attitude component. Some students did not clearly define the relevant emotion of the affective component. Students should appreciate the difference between the everyday meaning of having a 'feeling' that something occurs, as compared to experiencing an emotion as a feeling. That is, the statement 'Zachary has a feeling that dogs are dangerous' is different to 'Zachary fears dogs'.

Dot point four – the functions of attitudes

Responses to this dot point varied. Some students correctly identified a function, but were unclear in their connection to the scenario. The best-explained function was utilitarian/adaptive/instrumental as this appeared to be the best fit for the scenario. Often, students attempting to describe the ego-defensive function did not relate it to protection of self-esteem. Students attempting to describe the self-expressive function often did not mention that it told others about him. Students who attempted to describe the knowledge function also found it difficult to make sense of this in the context of the scenario. Some responses did not define what the function was before giving an example from the scenario.

Question 26

This question required students to describe and discuss different aspects of the topic Psychobiology of altered states of awareness, in particular, circadian rhythms and arousal. It had a mean of 10.20 marks, or 51.02%.

Dot point one – analyse the graph

Students were readily able to identify a section from the graph as the optimal time for playing tennis, usually choosing 12 noon as the highest level of alertness. Some students linked the optimal time to the type of task, with most stating that it was an easy task and therefore required the maximum level of alertness. Other students described the task as complex and stated an appropriate time for an optimal level of alertness. Some students showed that they did not understand the relationship between the type of task and the level of arousal needed.

Many students were able to analyse the graph and choose a time of day, but did not go on to convincingly argue why this would produce Anya's optimal level of performance. Some the best answers discussed the nature of the task (tennis) and why a particular arousal level would be optimal, then analysed the graph to find a suitable time of day.

Dot point two – symptoms of sleep deprivation

This was often the best-answered part of this extended response, with students providing a variety of correct responses for symptoms of sleep deprivation. Good answers then linked these to playing tennis. For example, lack of concentration was linked to the need to stay focused on the ball. Fatigue or tiredness, decreased concentration, irritability, and reduced reaction time were the more common answers.

Some gave symptoms that did not apply due to the short length of time involved, for example, the increased chance of catching infections due to reduced immune response, weight gain, or depression. Students are reminded to read the question carefully and to ensure their answers are relevant to and logical in that particular scenario. Some students listed symptoms, rather than describing how the symptoms would affect performance. Some symptoms were not relevant to tennis performance, for example, microsleeps. Some students used general knowledge to answer this question rather than demonstrating their learning in Psychology.

Dot point three – changing a low arousal level

Many students did not use the information in the scenario that Anya had a very low level of arousal. So, in discussing changing Anya's level of arousal students needed to suggest ways to increase that level. Other students misread the question and suggested that she should go to London a week earlier, or talked about her sleep hygiene, which did not demonstrate an understanding that Anya's arousal needed to be raised urgently in time for her tennis game the next day.

Students had mixed success in identifying strategies to increase Anya's arousal level. Effective answers went into detail about each strategy identified and how it could increase arousal. Students should refrain from everyday colloquialisms, as the purpose of the examination is to test for Stage 2 SACE level of learning and understanding in psychology. The most successful answers related to the scenario – how it would increase arousal and improve performance.

Dot point four – circadian rhythms

This dot point was the least well addressed in this question. Biological systems need to be understood much better; for example, many students are confusing the key concepts of light, suprachiasmatic nuclei, pineal gland, and melatonin. A number of students did not discuss melatonin, instead focusing on serotonin and cortisol as factors that control circadian rhythms.

A large number of students also listed genetics as a factor, but did not address circadian rhythms. Many students lost marks because their responses were about factors that conform to circadian rhythms (e.g. body temperature, blood sugar levels) instead of how they are controlled.

OPERATIONAL ADVICE

The presentation of samples was generally very helpful to moderators. Teachers are reminded to refer to packing instructions in the subject operational information for Psychology (available on the SACE website, www.sace.sa.edu.au). If necessary they should complete:

- an addendum to the learning and assessment plan
- a variation form, when there has been a breach of rules or assessed work is missing.

Teachers should include all sets of work requested by the SACE Board and only submit pieces of work that are part of that assessment decision. That is, no formative work should be submitted. Student work must be clearly identified with the student's SACE registration number to enable moderators to identify samples for each grade band.

It was less helpful to moderators when schools presented samples with no notations, marks, grades, or other evidence of the teacher's assessment decisions. Moderators are looking to confirm teachers' decisions and are supported in doing this when they can see the teacher's original feedback, marks, or grades.

Electronic feedback made it difficult to discern between teacher and student work. Teachers should be careful not to suggest ideas and phrases that become part of the student's summative submission. The use of electronic editing for review of student work appeared to increase the risk of this.

Teachers need to ensure that they are assessing according to the current performance standards and not allocate marks against the 'criteria for judging performance' that were used in curriculum statements before 2011.

Teachers should include comments indicating how an overall grade level was allocated for an assessment type. Individual tasks within an assessment type should *not* be allocated weightings. Assessment decisions using weightings within assessment types (e.g. 5% for each test and 20% for assignments) are not required and were not as accurate as others, made against the performance standards.

Evidence presented against the performance standards for knowledge and understanding should be consistently broad and to cover a range of psychological concepts to be awarded an A level. The A level cannot be achieved by students in only one or two heavily weighted tasks. That is, teachers should consider the entire body of work that each student presents for an assessment type and award the final grade as a reflection of the whole year's work in that type. Further, teachers should ensure that the grade levels allocated on the sets of work match up to the grade levels on the school assessment form (yellow).

GENERAL COMMENTS

Teachers should refer to the subject outline and support materials on the SACE website (www.sace.sa.edu.au) for information and advice about each of the school assessment types.

It is recommended that teachers consider joining the online community for Psychology on the SACE website, to make connections with other teachers and receive up-to-date information.

New teachers are encouraged to seek clarification and advice early in the year by attending clarifying forums and contacting the SACE Officer — Curriculum.

Chief Assessor
Psychology