# Government of South Australia LogoSACE Board Logo2023 Society and Culture Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2023 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.

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).

In 2023, there were several samples where students had explored more than 3 topics across the year. As per the 2023 subject outline, for a 20-credit subject ‘it is recommended that students study **three** **topics** (each from a different group of topics).’

School Assessment

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

* submitting digital samples that have ‘track changes’ or document ‘comments’ removed
* removing weightings for specific tasks within an assessment type. Tasks within an assessment type should be assessed holistically
* including any subject adjustments that were applied in the addendum section of the LAP
* providing VMM statements that accurately describe the nature of the variation.

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.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* providing opportunities for students to investigate local sociocultural issues in tasks, where they can readily access and evaluate various primary sources and provide recommendations or predictions (EC1, EC2)
* designing tasks that specifically facilitate discussion that is directly related to performance standards (i.e. KU2, KU3, IA2)
* providing flexibilities within closed choices in assessment tasks, rather than mandating that all students analyse the same source (documentaries, news articles etc.)
* using the broad range of flexibilities within the Folio to allow for students to communicate through a variety of different media.

The more successful responses commonly:

* used and cross-referenced a variety of primary and secondary sources to substantiate information that have been acknowledged appropriately (EC1)
* discussed the value of using different types of sources to explore a sociocultural issue e.g. expert opinions vs. those with lived experiences etc. (EC1)
* explicitly discussed, deconstructed, and/or evaluated different power structures in different contexts (IA2)
* used a variety of different communication modes across different assessment tasks (EC2)
* discussed a variety of ways in which sociocultural groups are connected (KU3)
* explored a range of issues across different tasks within the assessment type (KU1, IA1)
* used subject-specific vocabulary/terminologies e.g. power structures, social change
* analysed current news and laws which were relevant to the topic
* 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)
* had a clear purpose and well-defined boundaries/outcomes allowing for more insightful and in-depth analysis.

The less successful responses commonly:

* acknowledged sources inconsistently (EC1)
* used readily available sources and provided minimal evaluation of the value, or importance of different sources (EC1)
* discussed sociocultural issues with little acknowledgement for different stakeholder opinions and viewpoints
* communicated in an unsustained manner across different tasks within the assessment type (EC2)
* used generalised or outdated definitions to describe complex issues and groups of people (EC2)
* 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
* 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.

To provide students with the best opportunity for achievement, teachers can facilitate recording and reflection of all stages of the Social Action – planning (CL1), implementation (CL2), evaluation (CL1), and records of contribution (CL3).

Overall, 2023 submissions were a much-improved quality and quantity of evidence for this assessment type – photographs, audio, video, multimedia files, websites etc.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* providing students with opportunities to follow local and specific interests for social change within specific sociocultural groups, or contexts
* permitting different groups of students to explore different issues within a Key Area, rather than mandating that all groups explore the same specific issue
* guiding students to refine the scope of individual and group interactions e.g. not just addressing “Gender Inequality” or “Homelessness”, but these issues within a specific country, or demographic
* include video, audio, and/or multimedia evidence of the Social Action (CL2). Teacher notes, scripts, or simple anecdotal evidence are often insufficient for determining a student’s achievement
* including evidence that directly represents a student’s participation in the Social Action. Some Interaction samples exceeded 50 pages, that included work and evidence that did not directly relate to the student in question.

The more successful responses commonly:

* authentically engaged with the spirit of the Social Action, demonstrating how social influence and community engagement can critique and influence power structures in society
* provided clear and identified evidence of planning, implementation, and evaluation of the Social Action
* explored different Key Areas, sociocultural issues, or initiatives across the tasks (KU1)
* 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
* were oral activities that were engaging for students and the contemporary nature of the issues came through strongly e.g. roleplays.

The less successful responses commonly:

* included evidence of one Interaction, instead of two
* designed Interactions that were too broad, or grandiose in their goals. Social Actions should be achievable within the boundaries of a SACE Stage 2 assessment task
* did not carry out the proposed Social Action
* provided little evaluation of the effectiveness and possible improvements to each task (CL1)
* omitted evidence of the design process for the Social Action (CL1), which was the opportunity for students to undertake research, evaluate sources (EC1), and make decisions (CL2)
* provided PowerPoint and no audio/video
* displayed limited social actions to a comfortable/familiar/nondescript audience.

External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Investigation (30%)

For a 10-credit subject, students undertake one written Investigation up to 1,000 words in length.

For a 20-credit subject, students undertake one written Investigation up to 2,000 words in length.

Some of the sociocultural issues explored included: the impact of cancel culture; youth crime and violence; impacts of social media; body modification and representation; Covid-19; LGBTQIA+ issues, particularly linked with schooling and sport; mobile phone use in schools; and South Australian tourism.

In 2023, there was a clear trend identified by the marking team that performance standards KU2 and KU3 were left unaddressed in the Investigation by many students. Teachers are encouraged to guide students to understand the broad scope of the Investigation and meet each of the criteria outlined in the performance standards.

The marking team also noted that many students from the same schools had explored the same Investigation topics, which resulted in many Investigations using the same secondary sources, resulting in the same conclusions. Teachers are encouraged to observe the Investigation process closely to ensure when this occurs.

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

* removing student identifiers outside of their SACE number
* removing any physical or electronic marking, or drafting feedback on the document
* reminding students that the inclusion of communication with primary sources and analysis of secondary sources (in appendices) is not required in the Investigation

The more successful responses commonly:

* clearly defined the scope of the investigation within the overall investigation question/hypothesis, which was repeated in the focus questions
* explored local issues and connections, where students could access a range of primary sources. Even in the context of global or national issues, some mentioning of what this means in a local context often provided for rich discussion (IA1)
* explored sociocultural issues that were specific enough to be addressed within the allocated word count maxima
* used headings, paragraphing, and considered organisation to assist with reading and comprehension of the overall task (IA1, EC2)
* thoroughly explored causes and effects of different contemporary sociocultural issues (KU2, KU3)
* used sophisticated focus questions to explore the causes and effects of specific social change (KU2)
* used a variety of primary and secondary sources to support discussion and evaluated different perspectives throughout (EC1)
* used a consistent voice throughout the discussion, demonstrating good academic practice and drafting (EC2)
* demonstrated clear links between the purpose of primary research and the overall investigation scope, which included experts, stakeholders, and lived experiences (EC1).

The less successful responses commonly:

* left the overall investigation question unanswered (KU1)
* used generalised (often tertiary) sources for pivotal substantiations within the discussion (EC1)
* used generalised demographic or geographic contexts e.g. referring to the whole of Australia, when the issues explored pertained to a specific location, or referring to ‘teenagers’, when the specific issues referred to individuals over 18 years old
* explored the historical narrative of a sociocultural issue, rather than the contemporary or possible future discourse. Some historical background may be appropriate to explain the context of the discussion, however this should remain brief
* explored the issue from another subject discipline, rather than a sociological, ethnographic, or anthropological perspective
* conducted primary research that included convenience sampling, or perspectives that do not represent the investigation topic (EC1)
* included figures that were not discussed in the overall discussion (EC2)
* used emotive or personal recount discussion, rather than attempts to remain impartial
* explored issues outside of the very broad Key Areas of the subject
* described sources as ‘unbiased’
* attempted to use appendices to subvert the word count maxima. As they are appendices, these would not be considered when determining achievement.