

# **Society and Culture**

## **Stage 6 Draft Syllabus Package**

### **Consultation Report**

#### **1. Background**

The preparation of the Society and Culture Stage 6 Draft Syllabus Package took into account information from consultations and research associated with the recent evaluation/review in this subject.

Modifications to this draft, following widespread consultations, will enable the syllabus package to be finalised for submission to the Board Curriculum Committee, and the Board.

The Society and Culture Stage 6 Draft Syllabus Package has been distributed widely for comment over the period 1/3/99 to 26/3/99. Additionally, consultations on the Society and Culture Stage 6 Draft Syllabus Package have involved meetings with the following:

- ⇒ school sector representatives
  - β Department of Education and Training (DET)
  - β Tertiary and Further Education (TAFE)
  
- ⇒ tertiary representatives
  - β Associate Professor Catherine Lumby – University of Sydney
  - β Associate Professor Grant McCall – University of New South Wales
  - β Dr. David Dufty – Education Consultant
  - β Dr. Daryl Feil – University of Sydney
  - β Dr. Raja Jayaraman – University of Western Sydney
  
- ⇒ professional associations
  - β The Society and Culture Association Inc
  
- ⇒ other
  - β the Board Curriculum Committee for Social and Cultural Studies
  - β the HSC Examination Committee for Society and Culture

**Eighty two** written responses to the consultation progress report in Society and Culture were received. The sample profile is as follows:

**Individual responses: 68**

**Teachers** 33

**Rural** 11

Government 7 Catholic 2 Independent 2

**Metropolitan** 22

Government 14 Catholic 4 Independent 4

**Academics** 20

**Others** 15

**Institution/group responses: 14**

**Schools:** 7

Moderate (<500)	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">0</span>	Medium (500–800)	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">2</span>	Large (>800)	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">5</span>
Government	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">5</span>	Catholic	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">2</span>	Independent	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">0</span>

**Tertiary/post-school:** 1

Universities	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">0</span>	TAFE	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">1</span>	Industry/training	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">0</span>
--------------	--	------	--	-------------------	--

**Special Interest:** 6

Parent Groups	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">0</span>	School Sectors	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">3</span>	Other	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">1</span>
Teacher/professional associations			<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">2</span>		

## 2. Key Issues

<b>Summary of Key Issues for Stage 6 Society and Culture arising from the Consultation Process:</b>	<b>Summary of action taken as a result of these issues:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern expressed regarding possible difficulty covering the prescribed content within the indicative hours</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content in the revised syllabus has been made more explicit and content directions have been clarified. Content has been reduced in response to concerns expressed</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuing the choice from two questions in Depth Study sections of HSC examination is highly desirable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sample Examination has been developed considering whether to have one or option of two questions in each Depth Study. The Project Team and Sample Examination Team resolved a choice of two questions per Depth Study</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern expressed that the level of complexity and difficulty represented a challenge for lesser able students, especially Basic Human Issues section of HSC core</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the HSC Core Study more demanding content relating to Basic Human Issues has been removed, and all HSC Depth Studies reviewed and reorganised to ensure content is accessible for the full range of students, whilst still retaining content which is challenging to able students</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for parity across Depth Studies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depth Studies reviewed and rewritten where necessary to ensure parity</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for clear definitions of Methodologies to be studied in syllabus.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Glossary contains clear definitions of all methodologies mentioned in syllabus.</li> </ul>

### 3. Analysis

#### 3.1 Quantitative Analysis

##### 3.1.1 Society and Culture in the Stage 6 Curriculum

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
26	24	31	1	0	0
32%	29%	38%	1%	0	0

##### 3.1.2 Pathways for Society and Culture Stage 6 Students

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
21	23	31	3	1	2
26%	28%	38%	4%	2%	2%

##### 3.1.3 Aim

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
19	27	26	7	3	0
23%	33%	31%	9%	4%	0%

##### 3.1.4 Objectives

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
24	25	28	3	1	0
30%	31%	34%	4%	1%	0%

##### 3.1.5 Course Structure

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
21	29	26	2	4	0
26%	35%	32%	2%	5%	0%

##### 3.1.6 Outcomes

###### 3.1.6a

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20	27	30	5	0	0
24%	33%	37%	6%	0%	0%

###### 3.1.6b

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
25	26	27	4	0	0
30%	32%	33%	5%	0%	0%

##### 3.1.7 Content

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20	22	31	4	4	1
24%	27%	38%	5%	5%	1%

3.1.8 Assessment Components, Weightings and Tasks

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
19	16	33	7	5	1
23%	20%	41%	9%	6%	1%

3.1.9 Society and Culture Stage 6 HSC Examination Specifications

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
18	24	31	5	2	2
22%	29%	38%	7%	2%	2%

3.1.10 Post-School Opportunities

3.1.10a

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
27	21	20	7	6	1
33%	26%	24%	9%	7%	1%

3.1.10b

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
28	21	20	7	5	1
34%	26%	24%	9%	6%	1%

3.1.11 Glossary

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
22	24	31	2	1	1
27%	30%	39%	2%	1%	1%

3.1.12 Society and Culture Stage 6 Sample HSC Assessment Items

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
28	16	23	10	4	1
24%	20%	28%	12%	5%	1%

3.1.13 Society and Culture Stage 6 Draft Performance Bands

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
28	11	24	13	4	2
34%	13%	29%	17%	5%	2%

3.1.14 Overall Evaluation

Nil Response	Excellent as is	Good, with fine-tuning	Acceptable with re-working	Unsure	Unsatisfactory in issues treatment
19	10	44	5	2	2
23%	12%	54%	7%	2%	2%

#### 4 Issues Raised and Writing Team Action

Syllabus Item	Issues	Source/s	Action
Society and Culture in Stage 6 Curriculum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encapsulates syllabus ideology very succinctly</li> <li>Need to define key terms, eg. 'society'</li> </ul>	<p>Teacher</p> <p>Teachers Academic</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> <li>"Society" and other Fundamental Concepts explained on pp.16-17 of syllabus</li> </ul>
Pathways for Society and Culture Stage 6 Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to include 'Civics and Citizenship' in diagram</li> <li>Need to list other HSIE electives and include links from other learning areas</li> </ul>	<p>Teacher</p> <p>Teacher</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Civics and citizenship incorporated in mandatory History and Geography Stage 5 syllabuses, therefore there is no need to expand diagram</li> <li>Considered, aim is to keep diagram clear, concise and uncluttered</li> </ul>
Aim	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Difficult for beginning students and new teachers to comprehend</li> <li>Need to make specific mention of research skills</li> </ul>	<p>Teacher</p> <p>Teacher</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aim reconsidered and adjusted to improve explanation of subject</li> <li>Noted, not regarded as appropriate for Aim of Society and Culture. Research skills are integral to objectives and outcomes</li> </ul>

<p>Objectives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate 'social and cultural literacy' as a key concept</li> <li>• Term 'strategies for managing change' is unclear</li> <li>• Need to be expressed in such a way that students can use these to provide direction for study</li> <li>• The status of Values and Attitudes needs clarification</li> </ul>	<p>HOD</p> <p>Teacher</p> <p>Academic</p> <p>Teachers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social and cultural literacy maintained as overall aim of the syllabus therefore does not need including as a key concept</li> <li>• Objective is made more clear and elaborated in outcomes pp.14-15</li> <li>• Project team agrees, appropriate for objectives and outcomes to provide direction for student study. Reviewed to allow this.</li> <li>• Clarification given in the explanation on Social and Cultural Literacy</li> </ul>
<p>Course Structure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hierarchical diagram of course structure could be improved</li> <li>• Writing Brief names for Preliminary Course Studies are better</li> <li>• Is 'acculturation' the best term to use as a title?</li> </ul>	<p>Teacher</p> <p>Teachers</p> <p>Teacher Academics</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted, however project team consider present diagram is clear and consistent with other HSIE subjects</li> <li>• Depth Study names changed pp.21, 24, 27 to better reflect content</li> <li>• Title of Depth Study changed to "Personal and Social Identity".</li> </ul>

<p>Outcomes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some higher order outcomes will be beyond lesser able students</li> <li>• Role of power and authority' needs supplementing as it has too narrow a focus for one outcome</li> <li>• Express outcomes with a greater economy of words</li> <li>• Include outcomes for Values and Attitudes</li> </ul>	<p>Teachers</p> <p>Academic</p> <p>Teachers</p> <p>Teacher</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcomes considered by project team and rewritten to enable achievement by full range of students, pp.14-15 whilst maintaining challenge for more able students</li> <li>• Power and authority now supplemented with gender and technology to broaden objectives and outcomes p.14</li> <li>• Outcomes rewritten to be clearer and more concise, pp.14-15</li> <li>• There are Values and Attitudes objectives for Society and Culture.</li> </ul>
<p>Content</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough time to cover the content of the HSC course</li> <li>• Inclusion of 3 Unit content (eg. Basic Human Issues) too difficult for lesser able students</li> <li>• Inequities in amount of content from one Depth Study to another</li> </ul>	<p>Teachers</p> <p>Teachers</p> <p>Teachers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content made more explicit to allow coverage within indicative time pp.30-48 Changes endorsed by teacher reference group</li> <li>• Project team discussed concern - Basic Human Issues removed from Core p.30 to ensure course is accessible for all students. Project team considers syllabus is still challenging to more able students</li> <li>• Depth Studies rewritten to ensure equity and parity pp.32-48</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Glossary contains a full list of terms used in Depth Studies.</li> <li>• ‘Acculturation’ does not include ‘socialisation’</li> <li>• Include section on PIP requirements with PIP content</li> <li>• Include more detail and definition in research methodologies</li> <li>• Discussion of internal/external assessment of PIP</li> <li>• More emphasis on gender in Preliminary Depth Study 2</li> <li>• More emphasis on “information technology” in HSC Core</li> </ul>	<p>Teachers</p> <p>Academic</p> <p>Teachers and Professional Association</p> <p>Teachers Academics</p> <p>DET</p> <p>Academic</p> <p>Academic Teacher</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Glossary revised to ensure terms used in syllabus are clear for teachers and students pp.58-63</li> <li>• Terms expanded to apply socialisation and acculturation in the content where appropriate pp.23, 25, 26, 27</li> <li>• Project team determined the PIP Requirements and Assessment is to be located in Course Requirements section of syllabus</li> <li>• Research methodologies revised, based on broad majority opinion amongst academics, and to ensure that they are clear and accessible to all. pp.20-21</li> <li>• Vast majority of qualitative consultation data favoured external assessment of PIP</li> <li>• Gender included in “Coming of Age” p.26, objectives and outcomes P5 and H5</li> <li>• Technology included in objectives and outcomes P5 and H5</li> </ul>
--	---	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong support for information on Research Methodologies, especially for refinement of the Methodologies continuum of quantitative and qualitative methodologies</li> <li>• Suggestion for a section of text listings to clarify the major characteristics underpinning quantitative and qualitative methodologies</li> <li>• Clarification necessary for ethical research practices</li> <li>• Personal Reflection needs clarification in the context of its use in methodology</li> <li>• Suggested use of “method”, instead of the term “methodology”</li> <li>• Support for the explanations of</li> </ul>	<p>Academics Teachers</p> <p>Academic</p> <p>Academics</p> <p>Academic</p> <p>Academic</p> <p>Academics</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional examples placed on the continuum would make it too cluttered. Present examples, with some refinements are enough to demonstrate continuum of methodologies</li> <li>• This suggestion included</li> <li>• Statement on ethical research included in Social and Cultural Research Methodologies pp. 18-19</li> <li>• Amend use of Personal Reflection in all “Student will learn to” areas of the syllabus to clarify that this is a process which applies to all methodologies</li> <li>• Rejected, seen as too much change from directions of the Writing Brief</li> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
--	---	---	--

	qualitative and quantitative methodologies		
Course Requirement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content difficult to cover in indicative hours</li> </ul>	Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content reduced to ensure all sections of syllabus are able to be covered in indicative time</li> </ul>
Assessment components, weightings and tasks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is a 'non-HSC assessment task'? Will students take these seriously?</li> <li>Is non-HSC assessment worth too much?</li> <li>Should the PIP have more weighting?</li> <li>Are the terms 'standards-referencing' and 'normal distribution curve' mutually exclusive?</li> </ul>	<p>Teacher</p> <p>Teacher</p> <p>Teacher</p> <p>Teacher</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amended in revised assessment information in syllabus</li> <li>Weighting of assessment components clarified in syllabus</li> <li>Project team consider PIP is appropriately weighted to indicative time allocated to achieve PIP outcomes</li> <li>These terms are not mutually exclusive. Assessment and reporting in standards framework clarified in final syllabus</li> </ul>

<p>Society and Culture Stage 6 HSC Examination Specification</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Choice of two questions in Depth Studies is vastly preferable, offering one only may lead to questions which are too 'generic'</li></ul>	<p>Teachers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sample examination developed which address the issue of one or two questions in depth studies. Choice of two questions recommended by Sample examination team and Project Team</li></ul>
--	--	-----------------	--

<p>Post-School Opportunities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for need to be aware of linking course to changes in the workplace</li> </ul>	<p>Teacher</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarified in final syllabus</li> </ul>
<p>Glossary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be more extensive to include all important Depth Study terms</li> <li>• Simplify some definitions for lesser ability students</li> <li>• Strong support for the level of detail delivered in the Glossary definitions of Methodologies</li> </ul>	<p>Teachers</p> <p>Teachers</p> <p>Academics</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Glossary to include terms used in context of syllabus</li> <li>• Noted - definitions checked for accessibility</li> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
<p>Society and Culture Stage 6 Draft Performance Bands</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Band 6 appears too demanding</li> </ul>	<p>Teacher</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These are to be revised in current iteration and over future versions to ensure they reflect student performance</li> </ul>

Overall Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintains integrity of the previous course while also offering improvement and updating</li> </ul>	Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted, requires no action</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basis of a solid curriculum</li> </ul>	Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted, requires no action</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content overload</li> </ul>	Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content revised and reduced</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much expected of students</li> </ul>	Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic human issues removed (p.30) and content revised to allow for the full range of students, while maintaining a challenging syllabus.</li> </ul>

#### 4. Responses

Eighty two written responses were received from the following individuals and groups:

##### Individuals

Name	School/Group
David Dufty	Academic Consultant
E Marks	Asquith Girls High School
Judy-Ann Abdini	Blacktown Girls High School
Patrice Simpson	Burwood Girls High School
Dean Newbold	Cabramatta High School
Marigold Morgan	Canobolas Rural Technology H S, Orange
Jenny Follers	Canterbury Girls High School
Hilary Thomas	Cessnock High School
Len Palmer	Charles Sturt University, Bathurst
Noel Powell & Kris Darling	Corpus Christi College, Tuggerah
Kylie Thompson	Education Faculty, University of Sydney
Daniel Wetherall	Education Faculty, University of Sydney
Lauren Imber	Education Faculty, University of Sydney
Kylie Lowe	Education Faculty, University of Sydney
Michael Devine	Education Faculty, University of Sydney
Sonia Crisante	Education Faculty, University of Sydney
Ana Barbaric	Education Faculty, University of Sydney
Georgi Smith	Education Faculty, University of Sydney
Shanie Olic	Education Faculty, University of Sydney
Kaylene Thomas	Education Faculty, University of Sydney
Graham Allard	Engadine High School
Maria Limjap	Jamison High School, Penrith
Joan Jennings	Keira Technology High, Fairy Meadow
Trudy Gaul	Killarney Heights High School
Liz Lamb	Marist Sisters College, Woolwich
Patricia Mayne	Mater Maria College, Warriewood
P Murray	Model Farms High School, Baulkham Hills

Society and Culture Stage 6 Draft Syllabus Package Consultation Report

Name	School/Group
Robin Julian	Monte Sant' Angelo College, North Sydney
Debbie Gibbs	Mount Carmel High School Varrowille, Minto
Sue Wright	Mount Druitt TAFE
Michelle McCann	Mudgee High School
Edmund Esterbauer	New England Girls' School, Armidale
Fran Persaud	North Sydney Girls High School
Wayne Sutton	NSW PDHPE Teachers' Association
Greg De Coster	Oak Flats High School
Noelene Carter	Orara High School, Coffs Harbour
Peter Dean	Penshurst Girls High School
David Hanslow	Prairiewood High School, Wetherill Park
Lynn Siebels	Santa Sabina College, Strathfield
Gerrie McBurney-Fry	School of LDEE, Kingswood
Cheryl Dillon	Sydney Institute of TAFE, Ultimo
Teacher	St Andrews College, Marayong
Barbara Fogarty	St Clare's High School, Taree
Kevin Steed	St Marys Senior High School
C Torta	St Mary Star of the Sea College, Wollongong
Robert Moore	St Mary's Campus - All Saints College, Maitland
Michael Hood	St Patricks College, East Gosford
Sue Shaw	St Scholastica's College, Glebe
Steven Baker	St Ursulas College, Kingsgrove
Suzanne O'Connor	St Vincent's College, Potts Point
Penny Alexander	Sydney Technical High School, Bexley
Jan Ryan	Tweed River High School, Tweed Heads
Christine Stafford	University of New England
Steven Thiele	University of New England
Prof. Grant McCall	University of New South Wales
Ruth Reynolds	University of Newcastle
Paul Scott	University of Newcastle
Dr Daryl Feil	University of Sydney
Mike Horsley	University of Sydney
Tina Popas	University of Sydney

Name	School/Group
Assoc. Prof. Chris Deer	University of Technology, Lindfield
Peg White	University of Western Sydney
Dr. Raja Jayaraman	University of Western Sydney
Brenda Stewart	Vincentia High School

### Groups

Group
University of Sydney, Camperdown Campus
Fairfield High School, Fairfield
Nagle College, Blacktown
CEO Parramatta
Karabar High School, Queanbeyan
Narara Valley High School, Narara
Society and Culture Association Inc
Oxley High School, Tamworth
NSW Department of Education and Training
Society and Culture HSC Examination Committee 1999
NSW PDHPE Teachers' Association
Picton High School, Picton