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Kate: Hi, everyone. Thanks for accessing this HSC Hub community and family studies support resource. I'm Kate Rayner, the Curriculum Support Advisor in the PDHPE Secondary Education team. This resource is a part of a suite of videos focused on building understanding around the New South Wales Education Standards Authority glossary of key words. This resource aims to take a deeper look at the glossary words and how they can be explicitly taught in the subject of community and family studies. It focuses on the key word most commonly used in HSC examinations.

The CAFS glossary of key words resources can be accessed and watched in any order. Each resource is designed to build an understanding of a single glossary word, and it does this by breaking that word down, understanding how it can be represented in a marking criteria and then using student's sample responses to demonstrate the language of the word. Each resource models the step by step approach to building understanding. It shows teachers a way the glossary words can be explicitly taught. Teachers may decide they want to use parts of this resource with students as a guided model with a series of classroom activities allowing students to demonstrate their understanding of each glossary word and the language of the glossary word in responses. This resource uses a student sample responses or paragraphs to model the language of the glossary word and we'll do so in the context of community and family studies core content only. It's important to note though that the glossary of keywords can be directly transferred to the option content as well.

Glossary of key words what do they mean and how do I support my students to use them? The purpose behind the glossary is to help students better prepare for the HSC by showing them that certain key words are used similarly in examination questions across different subjects they're studying. In classrooms teachers of different subjects could use the glossary to help students to better understand what the exam question in their subject requires. Students should recognize the consistent approach of teachers of different subjects and get cues to how to approach exam questions. When using keywords to construct questions, tasks and marking criteria, it's helpful to ask what the use of the word in a particular question requires students to do. Key words are best discussed with students in the context of questions, content, and task they're working on, rather than in isolation.

Teachers must ensure that they do not use them in ways that conflict with their particular meaning within subjects. For example, a word like evaluate requires a different kind of response in mathematics to that from history. Account for in history requires a different response to that in CAFS. It's important to know where the similarities are and where the differences are. And talking to teachers across different KLA faculties will help to do this.

It's important to explain to students what the glossary of key words are and why we need to respond to them. We can see the glossary of keywords as a set of verbs, and we know a verb is a doing word like skipping or hopping. So, if I asked your students to do something like hop and then gave them the success criteria for it, such as move up and down off the ground continuously on one foot, what would it look like? How confident do you think they would be to start hopping? How confident would you be to make a judgment on how well they achieved it? Do you think any of them would have skipped? Probably not, and that's because they know what hopping looks like and you gave them the success criteria to achieve it. The glossary words can be seen in the exact same way, stage four and five and the prelim course are for students to learn what the verb looks like and build understanding of criteria to achieve success when responding to them. The same way they could achieve success when they responded to the doing word hop.

Therefore, the glossary of key words is asking students to do something with the content. The content, the information that's learned dictated by the syllabus doesn't change how it's represented on paper does. It's important to know that the complexity of these words changes. Starts with something simple like identify, which involves recall moving in complexity to a word like explain where students use the skill of identifying multiple concepts and show the effect of these concepts on each other. To analyse where students are using the skill of identifying concepts, creating a relationship, or effect between concepts and then thinking critically to demonstrate the impact of that relationship.

So, when teaching these words, we can't just apply the glossary word as it sits with the content in the syllabus. Students should not be rote learning responses. Teaching and learning activities are needed that offer the opportunity to think critically about the content to enable opinions to be formed and judgements to be made, or to problem solve so that students would be thinking about impact of actions. This learning and thinking will help students apply these glossary words to any content.

In this CAFS glossary of keywords resource, we'll take a deeper look at the word analyse. This next section will model is step by step approach to building understanding for the word analyse. And it will show you a way this glossary word can be explicitly taught. This section is designed to be delivered direct to students. Teachers may choose to use this for their own learning. Alternatively, teachers may consider showing the video direct to their class as they unpack the glossary word together.

The word analyse has a clear three step process, as set out in the definition. Identify components, the relationship between them and draw out and relate implications. Components can also be viewed as key ideas or concepts and the words can be used interchangeably. Analyse is considered to be higher order and usually has a higher mark value attached to it. And this is because in order to draw out the implications, students have to go through a series of steps to make their case. First, identify the components and provide detailed content knowledge to provide a background for the reader. This detailed background is usually provided through the characteristics and features of the two components. However, these characteristics and features can not be listed one after the other. Step two, they have to be shown through a clear link or relationship. This relationship will show how the two sets of characteristics relate to each other and usually demonstrate an effect of one component on the other. These statements of effect will be validated by examples. Stronger responses will show both positive and negative affect. This deep content knowledge and links of the components is important because it provides an attachment point or backstory for drawing out the implication. And finally, implications are directly related to the clear relationship that you've just shown. I'm going to draw your attention to the language of the definition, draw out and relate implication. The word implication implies future consequences of action or potential outcome or to be forward thinking or put simply what's the knock-on effect of the relationship that you've just shown me. This means that when you create your implication, it has to be an add on to the content that you've just given. And like all consequences or outcomes they may be shown as positive or negative. Here it's really important to note that there's no expectation that each paragraph show both the positives and negatives of the initial relationship and then again, the positives and negatives of the outcome or implication allow things to be shown organically as they come up. Sometimes students go straight to the implication because they've been taught that the definition of analyse is implications. However, it's important that the whole definition is addressed.

I've used the online program wordle to create the visual representation you can see on screen. The visual represents a summary of the language from the marking criteria for the top marks of all the questions that use the glossary word analyse from the last seven years of New South Wales, CAFS HSC examinations. The words that showed the characteristics from the top marks of the marking criteria were directly copied and pasted from the NESA examination pack into wordle. For every time a word is repeated the word within the wordle increases in size. Therefore, the larger the word the more common it was seen in the marking criteria. From the image we can see on screen, it can be seen that the words implications and clear which are the largest, are the most common from these marking criteria. Seen in the light blue writing on the left-hand side ‘implications’ and the bright red writing on the right hand side ‘clear’. Proving that to show clear implications is what this glossary word is asking us to do. However, there's three other ideas that are really jumping out to me when I look at this image.

The first relates to two of the dark blue words, ‘relationship’ sitting in the centre of the wordle and ‘link’ sitting above the word implication. It seemed to be the exact same size as the word implication. These two words are used interchangeably and represent the second step of the process. This shows that even though implications are seen as highly important, how the implication is attached to the rest of the response through the link or the relationship is equally as important.

The second key idea relates to two students showing ‘clear’ seen in the largest red text, implications seen in the largest word ‘implication’. These just means that students have to show the steps or the process of drawing out the implication and it can't stand alone. The third key idea for me relates back to the second largest font size, one in dark blue and the other in red ‘relevant’ and ‘examples’. Implications will only be clear if they're backed up by the support of content knowledge and validated by the examples given. The examples will only be relevant if they link directly back to the content and are highly specific in nature. Interestingly, for such a high order glossary word the language relating to the depth of content knowledge is much smaller than expected. It does reference the depth of content of knowledge and understanding by using language demonstrates extensive knowledge and understanding. But based on further investigation, because this wordle was created from all the marking criteria from both the core and the options, this language was only seen in the extended response marking criteria. For the marking criteria that used analysing the short answer responses that directly related to the core content the language attached to about the depth of content and understanding, was ‘clear implication’ and ‘comprehensive implication’ or ‘detailed implication’. This just means that it hasn't shown up clearly on the wordle or whenever the word analyse is placed in a short answer or extended response question, there is a clear expectation that students would demonstrate extensive knowledge and understanding.

The smaller language around these key words is interesting because it shows where in the syllabus the analyse questions have come from to date. For example, on screen you'll see words like parenting roles, social, ethical groups, service, confidentiality, suitability, ethical, research, conducting, indicating that questions using this glossary word are being used to address content from all three cores of the syllabus. You'll also notice language from three options, words like emerging, technologies, individual and work, labour trends, wellbeing, family, society, community, and organisations. These represents the content from the three options, family and societal interactions, social impact of technology, and individuals and work.

Finally, just remember if you can show you have the skills of recall to identify, then skill to develop a description of content by providing the characteristics and features and then skill to be able to link the concepts, components, or ideas, then students who perform well will then be able to build on this relationship themselves and apply the skills of critical thinking to question or interrogate their relationship. And show the implications either positive or negative of it. This could be to any course content, stronger students will look outside the content and make the connections to the real world.

In our next section we'll use a set of classroom activities which can be used in a range of ways as individual tasks for students to work through. These are also available as word docs for download on the HSC Hub. Teachers may choose to use this section for their own learning or use the activities with the class. In this instance, teachers may consider showing the video direct to their classes as they unpack the glossary words and work through each activity together.

The following slide show three samples. The first is a full script and the following two are single paragraphs that respond directly to analyse questions. These can be printed and worked on individually or pulled apart as a class. However, due to the broad nature of the content where examples are different to what you've been taught in class, seek clarification from your teacher. When reading through these see if you can identify and highlight to create a visual of the language within the text, that shows the formation of a relationship and then a direct implication. Write these words on a post it note and create a word bank for yourself. Or if in class create a word bank for classroom.

Note, the implication and relationship language is really different to the content specific language. When you're reading and pulling apart these samples, find the relationship and the implications of that relationship. Note where does the language sit in the paragraph? Is there a specific order for relationship and implication? Where are they made? Are they isolated sentences? Where does the relationship language sits in a sentence? Is it at the beginning, the middle or the end? How does the relationship language sit around that content? How has the implication been linked directly to the relationship? How are the effects of the relationship shown? Are there positive and negative effects of the relationship and has that caused a positive and negative implication? These are all important things to consider when you're responding to questions like this, if you can see how these are modelled in samples you could take this modelling and apply it to future responses.

Use the full sample script below from research methodology to find the relationship and implication language for the question, analyse the importance of the focus of research when developing an independent research project? 5 marks.

[Script provided in the supporting word document]

How did you go? On screen you'll see the exact same full script as the previous slide. I'll draw your attention to the dark red writing. It shows all the implication language. This is language such as “the implication of this could be”, “will lead to”, “will need more”, “thus increasing the potential outcome”. You'll notice that the red writing is towards the end of the response. This is because in order for the implication to be clear, there must be a development in the response and the implication must be a direct result from the relationship shown.

You'll also notice there is blue writing in the response this is the language that links or connects the two components of the question together. The first being the focus of research and the second the importance of it when developing an IRP. This blue language is connective or shows the effect of one component on the other such as “resulting in”, “produces” “also mean”, “creates”. The implication language follows the connective language, showing that the implication is a direct consequence of the established relationship.

Let's get back to the intention of this question. It asks you to show a relationship between two components, the first, the focus of research and the second, the importance of it when developing an IRP. This is a really simple part of the syllabus from research methodology and you may be questioning why there's such a high order glossary word attached to it. But as you can see from this response, there's nothing in the response that's difficult to understand. It just means that an application of other content knowledge needs to be applied and it is essential to know the full definition of the word analyse to create the response. Here we are asking you to apply all your knowledge of the research process and bring it back to the initial starting point of the process of the project development and why you chose a hypothesis or question. This requires strong knowledge around the whole process of research because in this case, implication implies future consequences of action or potential outcome. Meaning, how did the early decision of choosing a hypothesis or research question influence the outcome of the project? Weaker responses would have limited knowledge of the focus of research and link it in general to the IRP project, or would not show the difference between a hypothesis and a research question. Or simply even recount the process of developing their own IRP, due to limited syllabus knowledge. Stronger responses would show the specific characteristics and features of a hypothesis and a research question. The connection between the characteristics and why the choice is important for the IRP is established and then demonstrates how these decisions influenced the IRP project.

Can I draw your attention to the blue writing? That's the connective language or the language that shows the link or relationship. You can see that it sits in the middle of the sentence. If you were to highlight the content either side of this blue language, you'd see the initial start of the sentence would relate to component one and the ending of the sentence would relate to component two. This shows the direct relationship, but also the number of blue linking words in this response would support the marker to see the depth of content knowledge that the glossary would analyse needs. Finally, the implications are made following the linking of the components.

This questions links to the IRP. So it's essential that the examples referenced the situation of researching for an IRP. For example, students, Year 12, Community and Family Studies. The references strengthening this response include inexperienced researcher because we know that the process of research experienced in Year 12 Community and Family Studies might be the first initial time you've collected primary data for a self-developed focus of research. The other references linked to the resource of time due to the inflexible nature of assessment deadlines and stress being managed. This shows that this response directly relates to the question asked and acknowledges that other research experiences might be different, globalizing the research process.

Finally, I want to draw your attention back to that implication language. There's another point that we need to make clear. That's the red writing towards the end of the response. Here we have to show the knock-on effect or consequence of actions of using a hypothesis or a research question. The language of “the implications of this could be”, “would need more”, “may support” and “thus increasing potential outcome” uses inclusive language, of could, would, may, or potential. To suggest that although we don't know exactly what will happen, we are making a knowledgeable speculation that these implications might arise in the future. While unlikely the marking criteria for a five-mark question would have the expectation of both positive and negative implications, the inclusion of both in a response provided you have the space and the time to do so would strengthen the response, showing critical thinking about the issue.

Use the sample paragraph below from core two Groups in context, to find the relationship and implication language for the question, “Analyse the organisations within the community that assist in the satisfaction of the group’s needs?” Eight marks. This content is directly related to the category B content. And so, for this sample paragraph, I've used the category B group, The Homeless. However, you could respond with your knowledge of any of the category B groups that you've studied such as Culturally and linguistically diverse, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, Rural or remote families, Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, intersex communities, Sole parents, or The Aged.

[Script provided in the supporting word document]

“How did you go? On screen you'll see the exact same script as the previous slide. However, again, I'll draw your attention to the dark red writing. It shows all the language that draws out and relates implications. You'll notice that the dark red writing is towards the end of the paragraph and uses language such as, “to limit their risks of further”, “thus as a consequence of this”, “the potential outcome”, “a reliance” and “resulting in further”. Which implies future consequence or further or forward thinking. You'll also see that the dark red writing follows where the relationship between the two components are, seen in the blue writing again. And these shows directly how the steps of the definition of analyse are important in the structure of your response. The blue writing language is the clear relationship or link language such as “assists by”, “by having an organisation”.

Let's go back to the intention of this question. It asks you to show a relationship between component one, the organisations in the community, and two, assisting in the satisfaction of the group's needs. This requires strong syllabus knowledge to know the content that relates to this question. Weaker responses would link the to needs in general, or name names that are not in the current syllabus such as “basic needs” or “social needs”. Weaker responses would also suggest that the group's needs are fully satisfied. So even though the question suggests ‘assist’ implying a positive, there are still aspects of the organisation that will be unable to account for everyone's needs. And the stronger responses will draw this knowledge in. The importance when writing a ‘groups in context’ response is to show understanding of the group. And by this, I mean, to show that the group is diverse in nature has many needs and services and organisations support those needs, but there are factors affecting access to the services and organisations.

Another point here comes back to how you plan your notes. Here the syllabus is coming from the learn about dot point organisations in the community. There are no dash points underneath this to guide your response like some of the other learn about dot points. You have to create your own, do this by writing down the names of the organisations you could potentially talk about making sure you strategically choose organisations that satisfy a wide variety of needs. Then in your paragraphs pick the organisations that best suit the question.

This is an eight-mark question. And here I've linked this organisation to adequate standard of living needs and the implication to satisfying health needs. For the next paragraph choose an organisation like the Wayside Chapel that links to a different need such as the need of sense of identity. Or an organisation such as Uniting, who provide the Uniting Medically Supervised Injecting Centre that meets the needs of security and safety. Here there's a large amount of content that this question could relate to and it's really important that you do respond using specific examples and specific needs. But this requires planning. There could be any number of combinations between organisations and the six different needs and there's no right or wrong on the combinations. However, with such large amounts of content that you can choose from, to create relationships be strategic in your response. Think about the group, the diversity in that group and their specific needs will help you to do this.

You'll notice the light pink or the light red font at the beginning of the paragraph, this is different to the last script but this shows the specific characteristics and features of the hostel run by St. Vincent De Paul. If this response tried to cover all the services that the organiser ran, all the services that the hostel ran, this response would be really general and runs the risk of not analysing how the organisation assists in the satisfaction of needs. But perhaps just outlines them all. These characteristics and features are important because many of them initiate the establishment of the relationship between the organisation and the satisfaction of adequate standard of living and health needs.

I want to draw your attention back to the implication language. That's that red language towards the end of the response. Here we have to show the knock-on effect or the suggestion or consequence of accessing this organisation or not accessing it or if the organisation wasn't available. The language of “limits their risks of further” “thus”, “as a consequence”, “the potential outcome” and “resulting in further”, uses a mixture of inclusive language of likelihood and potential. Similar to what we saw in the previous script, suggesting that we're making a knowledgeable speculation, that these implications might arise in the future. However, some implication statements don't include this language because they are ensured implications. Meaning they will happen because of the facts of the service being gendered. So the language here doesn't have to be speculative.

Again, there's no right or wrongs with the implications as long as they're directly drawn out of the relationship you established. The implications suggest here to go beyond the obvious implications linking to further health implications, reliance on emergency departments and strains on health care workers. However, other implications to this example could relate to if the organisation couldn't satisfy the group's needs, it would mean that there's a more visible homeless community on the streets that could impact on tourism, the local economy, and bringing in outside customers or visitors. Or impact on people buying and investing in the local area. The question doesn't state this, however, as long as there is strong link that has been made between the component points of the question there is always an opportunity to bring in this wider knowledge from other cores or broad knowledge to make the connections. These implications aren't set out in the syllabus. These are conclusions or inferences drawn as a result of critical thinking about the situation and understanding the content and demonstrating and understanding that there is not a holistic solution for homelessness, but a broad issue for everybody in the community.

Use the sample paragraph below from core three Parenting and caring to find the relationship and implication language for the question. “Analyse how accessing formal support services can influence the wellbeing of first-time parents?” Eight marks.

[Script provided in the supporting word document]

How did you go with this last sample script? Are you starting to feel more confident to find their relationship and implication language? On screen you'll see the exact same script as the previous slide. However, again, I'm going to draw your attention back to that dark red writing. It shows the language that draws out and relates implications. You'll notice that the red writing is towards the end of the paragraph and you should be starting to notice that there's a pattern being established across these samples. The implication language highlighted here is “if this”, “it might trigger”, “might not be”, “could potentially”, “may reduce”, and “may support” and “lessen”. You'll also see that the dark red writing follows where the relationship between the two components are, seen in the blue writing again. This directly shows how the implications are drawn from the established relationship. The blue highlighted language is the clear relationship or link language such as “meaning that”, “might be experiencing” “can result in”, “alleviates the needs”.

So, let's pull apart this question. It asks you to show a relationship between component one, accessing formal support services and component two, how influences the wellbeing of first-time parents. This requires strong syllabus knowledge to know the content that relates to this question. Weaker responses would link support services in general to wellbeing, or name specific support services and link them to wellbeing in general. Or perhaps they might group the wellbeing such as listing, physical, social, and emotional wellbeing to the one support service, without explicit unpacking of how it impacts on the wellbeing. Or even support networks in general to wellbeing due to a lack of syllabus knowledge. There's a large amount of content that these questions could relate to and it's really important that you respond specifically. And this will require planning. The syllabus shows that formal supports could relate to healthcare, education, like this response, financial support, childcare, respite care, counselling, as this response also refers to. So that's six areas of formal support service. And must create a relationship to any of the six factors of wellbeing or potential ill-being of first-time parents. Social, physical, emotional, cultural, economic, and spiritual. They could be any number of combinations and there's no right or wrong on the combinations. However, with such a large amount of content, you can choose from to create the relationships be really strategic in your response. Thinking about the specific characteristics of first-time parents, and using them as examples will help you to do this. This will also help you to narrow down which formal support services of those six dot points you might respond with. Don't feel pressured to write about all six because you run the risk of just describing or explaining the influence on wellbeing, rather than going into further detail to show the implications.

This is an eight-mark question. These first paragraph focuses on enhancing knowledge, a content reference to the bolded italics heading on page 34 of the syllabus, preparations for becoming a parent or carer. As this question relates to first time parents, and accessing formal education services. The strength in this response is that it shows really strong references to first time parents. And this has been established in the first sentence with examples of postnatal care, paediatric care, birth certificates and parenting payments. These can all be linked to other formal services and can set up the following paragraphs. There would be an expectation that the syllabus language used in the following paragraph, such as financial support like Centrelink to access the parenting payments.

The sample paragraph strongly relates to biological parents. However, to show depth of understanding further paragraphs can relate to social parents as they may also be first time parents. Fostering or adopting a child of any age is still considered first time parenting if you haven't had previous children. And this could lead to accessing other services such as education services in relation to inter-country laws and citizenship or understanding residency visas. True if the adoption is through inter-country adoption or international surrogacy. If this was to happen it'd be a really strong response because you're creating clear links across the syllabus content and understand that there is many ways to become a parent, both biologically and socially.

In these same sample paragraph, the depth of content knowledge has been shown through the link of one formal support service to two aspects of wellbeing. I want to draw your attention back to that implication language, that red language towards the end of the response. Here we have to show the knock-on effect or suggestion or consequence of accessing this formal support service or not accessing it, or if it wasn't available. The language of “might trigger”, “could potentially”, “may reduce”, and “may support and lesson”, uses the inclusive language of might, may or could to suggest that although we don't know exactly what will happen or for the wellbeing of first-time parents if they access this formal support service, we are making a knowledgeable speculation that these implications might arise.

The implications suggested go beyond the obvious implications, linking to stretched resources or longer wait times to access support, showing that there's been critical thinking about this issue. Remember there is no right or wrongs with the implications as long as they're directly drawn from the relationship that you've established. So in this case, the implications could relate to personal injury of new mothers trying to travel to access face-to-face support further impacting on physical wellbeing. Impacts on economics so having to pay for face-to-face support leading to financial stress especially if there was no long-term parenting payment or right of return to employment. Maybe for the stress and feelings of failure if there's too much conflicting information or information is not accessed when needed such as through the night. These implications aren't set out in the syllabus these are strong conclusions or inferences drawn as a result of critical thinking about the situation and showing deep understanding of the situation for first time parents.

So many links can be made across the syllabus. So when looking at the content of a question like this, think about where else you might've seen it. What else do you know about the content in order to draw out other relevant implications? For example, here if you studied Individuals and Work, the option, the workplace structure of leaving entitlements could relate to enhancing knowledge and education of the workplace rights to ensure that new parents access parental leave. Or if you've studied Family and Societal Interactions, you could bring in content knowledge relating to the legislation around adoption and community supports to support new parents who adopt.

I'm going to give you a quick recap of some of the key tips you may have picked up on throughout this video. The first is the relationship between the two components must be clear. This is done through offering a strong background of the characteristics and features of each of the two components and they're not going to be listed one after the other but joined by that clear relationship language such as this causes, this leads to, this means. That was the blue writing in the script. And if we think about where it sat in a sentence it sat directly in the middle of a sentence. If you were to highlight the content either side of the blue language you'd see the initial start of the sentence would relate to component one and the ending of the sentence would relate to component two. For this glossary word we'd hope to see a number of the blue linking words in a response, and that would support the mark to see the depth of content knowledge that the analyse glossary word expects.

Finally, after these links, we need the implication, suggestion or knock-on effect. The implications must be attached to the relationship, isolated statements of implication lead the reader to question how the writer drew those conclusions. Therefore, analyse paragraphs are going to be large in nature because they follow the three steps. The implications can be in broad scope. And that means that the question might not necessarily define the implication, but you can show your ability to create links to the real world. And as long as there's a strong link between the two components of the question don't be scared to bring in your wider knowledge of other cores and that's going to show broad knowledge and the ability to create connections.

A final further tip if the marks allocation is high but there's a large number of content dot points to cover, don't feel like you have to cover them all. Be selective. It's better to show deep content knowledge and a clear link with potential positives or negatives from that relationship. And then the deep understanding of the result of that relationship which is the implication. Then just the content dot points and giving their characteristics and features. By now you would have collected on post it notes a word bank of the relationship and implication language that you could apply if you were to get a similar question in the HSC. However, what other language could be used build on your word bank in other ways of showing analysis.

[Content provided in the supporting word document]

Here's some extension activities that you could complete by yourself with a friend or together as a class. Use the paragraphs that have been given as a beginning paragraph for a whole script. For each of the questions identify exactly where in the syllabus it comes from and then identify other student learn about dot points or other ideas that can be used to create new paragraphs to keep a really clear structure. Use the paragraphs that you've been given to model what the other paragraphs might look like Next, think about marks that have been allocated. How many more paragraphs do you think would be needed? What if the marks changed? What if they lessened for those eight markers? How many paragraphs would you need then? Use the guide of three lines per mark to think about how much space you would have to respond to these questions. While this is not always the case but just a general guide practice in the space that you think you'd be allowed, but be sure to fill up every line, write small and go all the way to the edges of the lines.

Time yourself. After planning what you next paragraph looks like allow yourself to write the rest of the response. Respond to the question, but replace the word analyse with other glossary words such as describe or explain. How does this change their response? Would it change the number of paragraphs and the number of examples needed? What if the questions ask for proposal of strategies to reduce any of the negative implications? Have a discussion about what these strategies might look like and problem solve them. Swap your response with a friend, use a highlighter to show where you and your class might demonstrate a clear links and develop the reader's understanding of the implications. Use the tips as a checklist of a feedback.

Finally, I hope that you've been able to build your understanding of the glossary word analyse and armed yourself with some tips and strategies that you could easily apply if you were to get a question with analyse as the doing word in the HSC examination. Good luck.

End of Transcript