# Government of South Australia LogoSACE Board Logo2024 Society and Culture Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

This subject assessment advice, based on the 2024 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. It provides information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

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).

1. The Subject Renewal program has introduced changes for many subjects in 2025; these changes are detailed in the change log at the front of each subject outline. When reviewing the 2024 subject assessment advice, it is important to consider any updates to this subject to ensure the feedback in this document remains accurate.

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
* providing clear labelling of the group activity so it is obvious which student is the one selected for sample to moderate their individual contribution
* 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 (KU1, IA1, EC1, EC2)
* designing tasks that specifically facilitate discussion that is directly related to performance standards
* providing flexibilities within assessment tasks, rather than mandating that all students analyse the same source (documentaries, news articles etc.) (EC1)
* using the broad range of flexibilities within the Folio to allow for students to communicate through a variety of different media (EC2).

The more successful responses commonly:

* explored a range of issues across different tasks within the assessment type (KU1, IA1)
* discussed a variety of ways in which sociocultural groups are connected (KU3)
* had a clear purpose and well-defined boundaries/outcomes allowing for more insightful and in-depth analysis. (IA1, EC2)
* identified and analysed the nature and causes of social change, recognising similarities and differences over time (KU2)
* explicitly discussed, deconstructed, and/or evaluated different power structures in different contexts (IA2)
* 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 (EC1)
* used a variety of different communication modes across different assessment tasks. A consistent use of subject-specific vocabulary, including terms like "power structures" and "social change," further demonstrated a strong grasp of key concepts (KU2, IA2, EC2).

The less successful responses commonly:

* explained a broad social issue, focusing on defining the issue or context (KU1)
* stated actions or initiatives that could lead to social change, typically without awareness of likelihood or success (KU2)
* discussed sociocultural issues with little acknowledgement for different stakeholder opinions and viewpoints (KU3, EC1)
* retold facts/information rather than analysing information. (IA1)
* identified and explained power structures generally with minimal links to the topic or context (IA2)
* acknowledged sources inconsistently (EC1)
* used readily available sources and provided minimal evaluation of the value, or importance of different sources (EC1)
* 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)
* were generic in their approach (EC1).

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, the 2024 submissions maintained an excellent standard, offering both high-quality and ample evidence for this assessment type, including photographs, audio recordings, videos, multimedia files, and websites.

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
* including 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 change (CL2)
* provided clear and identified evidence of planning, implementation, and evaluation of the Social Action (CL1)
* was grounded in relevant and varied research, showcasing a deep understanding of a social issue. This research strengthened their ability to connect their actions to meaningful outcomes (CL1, CL2)
* included an exploration of the impact of their social action (CL1)
* explored different Key Areas, sociocultural issues, or initiatives across the tasks (KU1)
* were oral activities that were engaging for students and the contemporary nature of the issues came through strongly e.g. roleplays (EC1, EC2).

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* 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 (IA1)
* did not carry out the proposed Social Action (CL1, CL2, CL3)
* 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 (EC1, EC2)
* displayed limited Social Actions to a comfortable/familiar/nondescript audience (CL1, CL2, CL3)
* had a lack of reflection by individual students on Social Action. (CL3)

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, but aren’t limited to:

* Crime and Police
* Women's/Feminist issues (misogyny, abortion, representation, sanitary products/endometriosis, women in sport and trad-wives)
* Religion
* Climate and environment-related
* Sport
* AI and the possible effects
* Phones/Social Media ban
* Health and Mental Health
* Vaping
* Driving
* Gaming
* Social Media
* Schooling
* Domestic Violence
* Mental Health of people in rural communities.

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.

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
* reminding students that appendices are not part of the word count. As they are appendices, these would not be considered when determining achievement.

The more successful responses commonly:

* clearly defined the scope of the investigation within the overall investigation question/hypothesis, which was developed in the focus questions (IA1)
* 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 (EC2)
* 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, rather than broad topics (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)
* investigated issues where a distinct conclusion could be formed that is informed by evidence (KU1, IA1, 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)
* 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 (EC2)
* explored issues outside of the very broad Key Areas of the subject (IA1), including focusing on other disciplines like health or dedicating a large portion of evidence to historical contexts
* described sources as ‘unbiased’ (IA1)
* unclear or vague guiding question that did not effectively direct the investigation (IA1)
* were disorganised, lacking a clear introduction, focusing questions, or a strong conclusion. Referencing was either incomplete or incorrect (EC1, EC2)
* had little to no explicit mention of social change, and analysis lacked depth (KU2, IA1)
* lacked connectives and transitions (either missing or poorly used), making the analysis weak (EC2)
* had focusing question paragraphs were often written as disjointed summaries without clear topic or linking sentences, leading to sections that did not directly answer or support the guiding question (EC2)
* tended to pose rhetorical questions or questions but not actually answer them, which showed a lack of analysis (IA1)
* were argumentative essays rather than an investigation (KU1, KU2, IA1, EC2)
* poorly designed question or no focus question/hypothesis at all (KU1)
* did not allow students to address the contemporary issues in-depth (KU1, KU3)
* cited issues with no real way to discuss effects or future predictions (KU1, EC2).