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## Rundown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 am – 9:35 am</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:35 am – 10:35 am</td>
<td>Review on 2014 IES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:35 am – 11:05 am</td>
<td>Structured Enquiry Approach Sample Illustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:05 am – 11:20 am</td>
<td>Administrative Arrangements for 2015 IES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20 am – 11:30 am</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 am – 12:30 pm</td>
<td>SC Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review on 2014 IES

- Issue of Plagiarism
- General Performance of 2014 IES and Suggestions for Improvement
- 2014 IES Moderation Results
Issue of Plagiarism
What constitutes serious plagiarism?

Serious cases (P) cases in which nearly the whole or the whole SBA task/assignment is plagiarised, with very little or no contribution from the student.

Extracted from HKEAA: DSE/SBA/GEN 13/2
What constitutes serious plagiarism? (illustrated by proven cases)

It is a serious plagiarism case when the student making no effort in doing the IES

- Copying the whole work from source/sources without making any acknowledgement
  as seen in a 2014 (P) case

- Presenting the whole work completed by others as one’s work
  as seen in a 2012 (P) case
Punishment of the (P) cases

- Public Examinations Board (PEB) decide on the penalty to be imposed on the proven (P) cases.

- The levels of penalty are as follows:
  - **Zero marks** will be given to the task. An additional penalty of **downgrade by one level** on the subject result.
  - For extreme cases, e.g. repeated offence of plagiarism, **disqualification from the subject(s) concerned or the whole exam** may be imposed.
Other plagiarism cases (non (P) cases)

The student made some contribution to the work but

- a major part was copied
- the claimed personal analysis / conclusion being copied materials
- Lack of proper acknowledgement
Handling of the other plagiarism cases

- Other plagiarism cases are to be handled by schools.
- Mark penalty on the task is suggested to be imposed.
- The marks given should reflect the performance of the student who has made slight contribution to the task.
How to properly acknowledge the sources?

- Properly acknowledged the sources with footnotes, endnotes and annexes
- Proper citations
General Performance of 2014 IES and Suggestions for Improvement

(Mr Cheung Yui Fai, IES Supervisor)
2014 IES
Moderation Results
Hybrid Approach

Task marks (80%) which is subject to:

Statistical Moderation
- Determination of a school’s IES performance level with reference to the performance of the school in public examination (reliability)

Supplement with sample re-assessment
- Determination of a school’s IES performance level by re-marking a sample of student work from the school (validity)

Process marks (20%) which is not moderated
Some Statistics

- Correlation between school exam mean and school raw SBA mean is **0.71**
- **499** participating schools
- Overall moderated Task mean: **47.9/80**
- Raw school mean vs. Final moderated school mean
  - **59.3%** of the schools were within expectation
  - **17.8%** higher than expected
  - **22.8%** lower than expected
- Compared with last year, more schools were in the “within the expected range” (**2013: 56.8%**)
- It is supposed due to that teachers have a better understanding of the marking standards
IES Sample Review

Outlier Detection: Checking the validity of statistical moderation results on Task

Major Features:
- Re-assessment by external assessors
  - Discrepancy marking: \( \approx 9.7\% \)
  - Correl. between raw mark and the sample review result is 0.77

- Sampling variation (6 samples selected): School Sample Raw Mean is closely aligned with School Overall Raw Mean in most cases
  - For some 90% of schools, the differences (between School Sample Raw mean and School Overall Raw Mean) are some 5 marks (out of full marks = 80)
  - Adjustment applied due to such kind of sampling variations (Ratio estimation method)
    - Case (i): Sample mean < School mean \( \rightarrow \) Sample review results adjusted↑
    - Case (ii): Sample mean > School mean \( \rightarrow \) Sample review results adjusted↓
IES Sampled Product Review Exercise

Comparing sample review result of each school with the corresponding one from statistical moderation, two possible scenarios:

- If two sets of results are largely in line, then statistical moderation result will be adopted

  OR

- If two sets of results are prominently different, then statistical moderation result will be adjusted

  Statistical moderation results of some schools are subject to adjustments with different magnitudes
School Feedback Letter

Statistics of the moderation group*

School所提交的考生人数:
No. of Candidates submitted by School:

調整組別的人數**:
No. of Candidates in the Moderation Group**:

校本評核原始分數的平均分:
Mean of raw SBA scores:

校本評核原始分數的標準差:
Standard deviation of raw SBA scores:

調整後校本評核的平均分:
Mean of moderated SBA scores:

調整後校本評核分數的標準差:
Standard deviation of moderated SBA scores:

Comment on adjustment applied to mean

評語:
Comments:

校本評核原始分數的平均分 略低於預期範圍。
The mean of the raw SBA scores is slightly lower than expected.

校本評核原始分數的分布 合乎預期範圍。
The spread of the raw SBA scores is within the expected range.

Comment on adjustment applied to spread
Comment on Adjustment Applied to School Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Magnitude of D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the expected range</td>
<td>$0 \leq D &lt; 5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly lower than/ higher than expected</td>
<td>$5 \leq D &lt; 10$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower/ higher than expected</td>
<td>$10 \leq D &lt; 15$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much lower/ higher than expected</td>
<td>$D \geq 15$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Implication of the comment on the mean of the Task marks

(D = difference between the means of the moderated and raw Task marks (total = 80))
Comment on Adjustment Applied to School Spread

R, the ratio is compiled as:

\[ R = \frac{\text{Moderated spread of Task marks}}{\text{Raw spread of Task marks}} \]

Table 2: Implication of the comment on the spread of the Task marks

(R = ratio of the standard deviations of the moderated and raw Task marks (total = 80))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Magnitude of R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the expected range</td>
<td>0.78 &lt; R &lt; 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly wider than expected</td>
<td>0.74 &lt; R \leq 0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider than expected</td>
<td>R \leq 0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly narrower than expected</td>
<td>1.1 \leq R &lt; 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrower than expected</td>
<td>R \geq 1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Example: Derivation of a Student’s Final Moderated Mark of a School

School A:
Raw mean = 30      Moderated mean = 28
Raw spread = 10    Moderated spread = 9    R = 0.9

Student John:
Raw mark = 40
Final moderated mark = 28 + (40 – 30) x 0.9 = 37

Student May:
Raw mark = 20
Final moderated mark = 28 + (20 -30) x 0.9 = 19

Note: The difference in SBA performance between John and May changes from 20 to 18.
Structured Enquiry Approach of Independent Enquiry Study
Highlights of the Implementation of the Structured Enquiry Approach of IES

(Mr Cheung Yui Fai, IES Supervisor)
Structured Enquiry Approach
Sample Illustration
Four Steps for Conducting IES

Step 1: Problem Definition

Step 2: Relevant Concepts and Knowledge/Facts/Data

Step 3: In-depth Explanation of the Issue

Step 4: Judgement and Justification
Sample 4

Title: Should Functional Constituency elections in the Legislative Council be abolished?
A. Problem Definition

- Mainly on What and Why
- Identification
  - Background info (e.g. brief history of FCs)
  - Controversies & Differences

It is arguable whether the FCs are incompatible or compatible with universal suffrage ... divided views in the community (Para 1)
A. Problem Definition

... before handover... as a buffer... now is ready for directly elected legislature... aware of their political rights and freedoms in recent years. (Para 3)  

Keeping abreast of latest development?

... existing tradition Functional Constituencies... are still undemocratic... analyzing the relationship between the principles of universal suffrage and functional constituencies... (Paras 4 & 5)

Making inference by contrasting some principles → further analysis
A. Problem Definition

● Focus Questions (pp. 3-4)

(1) “analyzing the relationship between the principles of universal suffrage and FC”
(2) “the arrangement and electoral base of the FCs”
(3) “the performance and popularity of FCs lawmakers”

The aim of this report is to evaluate whether the FCs should be abolished in the Legislation Council election by analyzing the relationship between the principles of universal suffrage and functional constituencies, the arrangement and electoral base of the FCs, the performance and the popularity of FCs lawmakers, etc.

p. 3

p. 4
B. Relevant Concepts and Knowledge/Facts/Data

- Explaining the current arrangements → degree of democracy/democratic ingredients (pp. 5-6)
  - Voting system, number of electors (unable to compare the composition of the bases of electorate of different FCs)

Legislative Council arrangement

Currently, according to the 2012 LegCo election arrangement, there are 30 elected by 28 traditional FCs, whereas 40 out of the 70 Legislative Council seats are directly elected by the general public (35 through Geographical Constituencies (GCs) and 5 through District Council (Second) functional constituency). The details see the table below.

Composition (70 seats)
- 35 members to be returned from Geographical Constituencies (GCs)
- 35 members to be returned from Functional Constituencies (FCs)

Geographical Constituencies (“GCs”) (35 seats)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hong Kong Island</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kowloon West</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kowloon East</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>New Territories West</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>New Territories East</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting system: List system of proportional representation

Functional Constituencies (“FCs”) (35 seats)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Heung Yee Kuk*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agriculture and Fisheries*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Insurance*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Transport*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of electors

Geographical Constituencies: 3,466,201
Functional Constituencies: 240,735*

* Excluding 3,219,755 electors of the District Council (second) functional constituency
Contrasting with the election arrangement of LegCo stipulated in the BL (pp. 6-7)
– Article 68 (ultimate aim... universal suffrage)

Election arrangement of LegCo in the Basic Law

Regarding the method for forming the Legislative Council, Article 68 of the Basic Law stipulates that “...shall be specified in the light of the actual situation in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and in accordance with the principle of gradual and orderly progress. The ultimate aim is the election of all the members of the Legislative Council by universal suffrage.” Therefore, implementing universal suffrage ultimately is a requirement under the Basic Law.
B. Relevant Concepts and Knowledge/ Facts/ Data

● Identifying key concepts
  – Balanced participation
    • “wide acceptance”, “political stability”, “sustainable and orderly democratization”, “freedom of choices”, “consensus”, etc.

The principle of balanced participation

The principles of balanced participation ensure wide acceptance and support to the political system, and hence maintain political stability as well as sustainable and orderly democratization. Different countries have different perceptions of and planning for balanced participation and according to their own conditions. While respecting the dignity and freedom of choice of individuals, the design of the political structure and electoral systems of a place are determined by other factors such as its own national conditions, history, tradition and culture, state of economy, ethnic characteristics and established values. Therefore, it requires an open discussion to decide the meaning of balanced participation in the LegCo with consensus in the society.

Adoption of the Principles of “Universal Suffrage” and “Balanced Participation” — Practices in Some Democratic Countries


B. Relevant Concepts and Knowledge/ Facts/ Data

- “University and equality”
  - International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Article 25)
  - BL Article 39

**Universality and equality**

According to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), Article 25, it states,

- Every citizen shall have the right and the opportunity, without any of the distinctions mentioned in article 2 and without unreasonable restrictions:
  - (a) To take part in the conduct of public affairs, directly or through freely chosen representatives;
  - (b) To vote and to be elected at genuine periodic elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret ballot, guaranteeing the free expression of the will of the electors;
  - (c) To have access, on general terms of equality, to public service in his country.

- “Universal suffrage” (p. 8)
  - “Right to vote and opportunities to vote”
  - “Granted in the BL”

**Related the BL to an international covenant ➔ relevancy of the concepts to the study should have been articulated**

**Appropriate concept, but relevance to the topic should have been pointed out directly**
Marking Domain: *Problem Definition and Identification of Concepts/ Knowledge*

● General Comments
  – Defined the objective of the enquiry study clearly
  – Elaborated clearly on some concepts/ basic facts related to the study but the role of the concepts in the enquiry was not well articulated
  – Explained the importance of some of the concepts (e.g. the principle of balanced participation) to the discussion of Functional Constituencies (FC), but seemingly biased to the concepts related to the abolition of FC. The concepts such as “principles of gradual and orderly progress” (Article 68, Basic law of the HKSAR) and “populism” or “welfarism” could have been included in the report
Marking Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Level (Marks)#</th>
<th>Problem Definition and Identification of Concepts/knowledge (Weighting: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Outstanding Achievement** (7 – 9 marks) | • Defines and explains clearly the focus and scope of the enquiry, the enquiry plan (e.g. perspectives for enquiry)/data collection method; articulates clearly the significance of the issue  
• Clearly identifies necessary and highly relevant concepts/knowledge and explains the relevance and applicability to the enquiry |
C. In-depth Explanation of the Issue

- Mainly on What and How
- More details on the nature, significance, controversies and dilemma of the issue
  - Situation
    - Divided views (e.g. concerns, interests, etc.)
  - Explanation
    - Principles → in terms of interpretation
    - Concepts/ values in conflict
  - Information
    - Facts/ Figures (as evidence)
C. In-depth Explanation of the Issue

- “Imbalance representativeness between FCs and GCs”
  - Electoral base comparison (238022 vs 3471423) (facts)
  - Franchise/ elites/ sectoral interests (concepts)
  - Representativeness issue → unequal (concepts)

- “Nomination requirement” (eligibility/ qualification of voters)
  - Corporate vote vs individual votes (facts)
  - Unrepresentative/ elitism/ inequality (concepts)

- “Lack of Competition”
  - Uncontested candidates: 16 out of 30 seats of FCs (facts)
  - Narrow electoral base (Agriculture and Fisheries FC) (facts)

Support abolition of FCs (pp. 9-11)
C. In-depth Explanation of the Issue

- “Realizing balanced participation”
  - “Voices of business and professional sectors” (source)\(^20\)
  - Hong Kong context (“uniqueness”/ “prosperity and stability”) (source)\(^20\)
  - HK is an Special Administrative Region (BL)

- “Performing safeguarding function” \(^21\) (source)
  - “Welfare society”
  - “Bicameral voting system”

- “Avoid too political in the council” (source)\(^22\)
  - “Postpone the effectiveness of the government”
  - “effectiveness of the executive must be affected”

*Keeping FCs (p. 12)*
C. In-depth Explanation of the Issue

- Using secondary sources to explain WHAT and HOW

---

14 ‘Should Functional Constituency be abolished’
http://cdehk.com/%E7%AB%8B%E6%B3%95%E6%A9%9F%E9%97%9C/%E6%87%89%E5%90%A6%E5%BB%A2%E9%99%A4%E5%8A%9F%E8%83%BD%E7%B5%84%E5%88%A5/?lang=en

15 A Critical Introduction to Hong Kong’s Functional Constituencies
http://www.procommons.org.hk/%E6%A2%81%E5%85%86%E6%98%8C%E3%80%81%E9%83%AD%E6%A6%AE%E9%8F%97-%E8%A7%3E%E6%A7%8B%E5%8A%9F%E8%83%BD%E7%B5%84%E5%88%A5%E4%B8%80-%E4%BD%95%E4%BE%86%E3%80%8CE5%9D%87%E8%A1%A1%E5%8F%83%E8%88%87

17 ‘Scrap-or-keep’ debate on functional constituencies leads us nowhere, SCMP, 21 October, 2013

---

19 廢除功能組別必釀 5 大惡果 http://paper.wenweipo.com [2013-11-12]


21 ‘Function Constituencies help realizing balanced participation’

22 廢除功能組別必釀 5 大惡果 http://paper.wenweipo.com [2013-11-12]
D. Judgement and Justification

- Judgement: “Support to abolish the FCs”
- Justification
  - “Convergence of the BL”\(^\text{23}\)
    - BL: Ultimate aim \(\rightarrow\) Universal suffrage of the LegCo
    - Mainland: 2020 \(\rightarrow\) universal Suffrage\(^\text{24}\) (p. 13)

- “Violate the principle[s] of universal [suffrage] and equality”\(^\text{25, 26 & 27}\) (pp. 13-14) (e.g.)
  - “against the idea of ‘equal’ suffrage”
  - Views from HK Bar Association & HK Govt
  - Counter argument \(\rightarrow\) rebuttal (performance of FC legislators)

Evidence: Constitutional Documents & historical Facts

Evidence: Three perspectives:
1. Principles/ values
2. Important Views
3. Criterion: Performance of Legislators from FCs
D. Judgement and Justification

- Judgement: **“Support to abolish the FCs”**
- Justification
  - **“Poorer performance from FCs”** (pp. 14-16)
    - “Weak in upholding the duty and supervision of the government” (facts: a table)
    - Weak in popularity (**survey** results: a table)

**Table 2.1: The average number of questions initiated by lawmakers in 2012-13 Legislative Council’s meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Function Constituency lawmakers</th>
<th>Geographical Constituency lawmakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of questions</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.2: The average number of motions and amendments to the motion proposed by lawmakers in 2012-13 Legislative Council’s meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Function Constituency lawmakers</th>
<th>Geographical Constituency lawmakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of questions</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.3: The average number of speeches initiated by lawmakers in 2012-13 Legislative Council’s meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Function Constituency lawmakers</th>
<th>Geographical Constituency lawmakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of questions</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance based evidence:
1. (no. of questions raised by legislators as a criterion)
2. Opinion Survey data
D. Judgement and Justification

- Judgement: “Support to abolish the FCs”
- Justification
  - “Veto by minority in LegCo” (p. 16)
    - FC members → “minority voice” (in terms of electoral base)
    - “Split voting” → “distort the representativeness of general public”

Proven with facts

Good point but more elaboration is needed

Application of principles/values to argue
D. Judgement and Justification

- Using secondary sources from different perspectives as evidence (e.g. principles, views, facts, opinion survey data, etc.) to make justification

---


---

27 Frequently Asked Questions on Functional Constituencies [http://www.procommons.org.hk/newsletter-on-political-reform-3-%E6%94%BF%E6%94%B9%E9%80%9A%E8%A8%8A%E7%AC%AC%E4%B8%89%E6%9C%9F]

28 Catholic Monitors on Legislative Councilors 2012-2013 Monitors Report [http://www.legco-monitors.org/]

---

Marking Domain: Explanation and Justification

● General Comments
  – Showed a **good understanding of the controversy** of the abolition of FC
  – Provided an **in-depth analysis** of the need to abolish functional constituencies with regard to the crux of the contention discussed in Part C, e.g. the Basic Law, equality and the functions of FC, **demonstrating multiple perspective thinking** and **profound knowledge of relevant concepts**
  – Was able to substantiate his/her arguments logically with evidence from **various sources**
  – Could have scored higher if the discussion of the abolition of FC was extended further to **other impacts** (e.g. the impact on the society and livelihood)
## Marking Guidelines

### Performance Level (Marks)#

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanation and Justification (Weighting: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Achievement (7 – 9 marks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Deploys highly useful information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides a highly relevant linkage between the analysis, justification and the information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sharply identifies, clearly and logically articulates factors/impacts/relationships/major viewpoints of key stakeholders, dynamic relationships/disagreements/embedded values in the issue, with highly relevant concepts and knowledge/facts/up-to-date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fully and logically justifies the standpoint/choices/decision with highly relevant concepts and knowledge/facts/up-to-date information, showing strong logical reasoning and high level of multiple-perspective thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides insightful ideas/views, which are relevant to the issue concerned and the enquiry question, with supportive arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Addresses well the issue and the enquiry question with a comprehensive analysis from multiple perspectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marking Domain: Presentation and Organization

• General Comments
  • Was able to express his/her ideas clearly throughout the report, with clear paragraphing, logical and well-supported arguments
  • Acknowledged the sources in detail
  • The organisation of Parts A to D is coherent and well structured
## Marking Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Level (Marks)#</th>
<th>Presentation and Organisation* (Weighting: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Outstanding Achievement (7 – 9 marks) | • Communicates ideas in a concise and well-organised manner, with a coherent structure  
• Uses data effectively (e.g. in the form of tables, photographs, charts and figures)  
• Clearly and accurately acknowledges sources of information |
樣本 7
探究目的及焦點問題

1. 青少年使用 Facebook 的情況
2. Facebook 可否促進青少年與朋友的社交關係?
3. Facebook 如何促進青少年與朋友的社交關係?

題目界定

本研究希望以青少年作為研究對象，除了我本身是青少年外，長期研究青少年犯罪行為的美國學者 Jeffrey Butts (2009) 指出，正面的社會歸屬感對青少年促進學術成績甚至減少偏差行為有正面關係。因此青少年會如何使用 Facebook 的社交功能、他們與朋友互動的情況是怎樣的、而 Facebook 作為青少年常用的社交工具，是否真的能促進青少年的社交關係，這些社會現象都令我對這個議題產生興趣。

1. 塗鴉墻 (The Wall)：顯示用戶的狀態和可供用戶於朋友的塗鴉墙上留言或分享狀態。
2. 狀態 (Status)：用戶可發佈自己的狀態，例如與 Facebook 上的朋友分享自己的近況。瀏覽者可以讚好或留言形式作出互動和回應。
3. 讚 (Like)：瀏覽者可以按讚好作出讚賞和表達共鳴感。
4. 分享 (Share)：瀏覽者分享內容至自己的塗鴉墻或私密訊息。
5. 訊息 (Messages)：只有收信人和發信人才能看到的私密訊息，是雙方或多方的私人聊天室。

本文將利用上述功能探究青少年使用 Facebook 的狀況。

集中分析這三項，但欠說明
維繫社交關係的方法如下：

1. 正面積極：雙方相處時保持積極能令雙方都樂在其中，能有效維繫社交關係。
2. 互助：能協助對方處理各項事務
3. 互信：雙方在交往的過程中透露自己的弱點，互信能令雙方坦誠相對。

維繫社交關係的活動有很多，其中包括透過電子媒體與外界(例如:與朋友)接觸，減少人們孤獨無助的感覺，亦可避免人們與社會脫節。
我會觀察三位青少年使用 Facebook 的情況。青少年甲和乙是今屆文憑試放榜的中六學生。青少年丙是大學一年級的學生。三位青少年皆是 Facebook 的頻密用戶，而且在過去兩個月內發報的內容既多元化又有很多朋友讚好和回應，所以三位的 Facebook 塗鴉墻都適合作為觀察對象。
題目界定和概念／知識辨識

● 探究有焦點
● 探究方法能緊扣焦點問題
● 解釋主要概念，但可更詳盡解釋這些概念與該探究的關係（如可怎樣衡量社交關係）
● 也可更深入了解為何要進行這探究及探究方法（如怎樣搜集社交關係的資料及調查對象的選取）
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>表現水平（分數）#</th>
<th>題目界定和概念／知識辨識（比重:3）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>表現滿意（4－6分）</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 訂立及清楚闡釋探究焦點及範圍、探究方案（例如探究向度）／資料搜集方法；清晰表達議題的重要性</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 簡單指出一些概念，但不全然相關；雖嘗試解釋這些概念與該探究的相關性及如何應用在這探究上，但欠清晰；或遺漏一些主要的概念</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 深入解釋議題

a. 分享自己的生活

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>狀態內容</th>
<th>回應統計</th>
<th>具體回應內容，反映與朋友的社交關係</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>青少年甲</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>青少年甲-狀態(1)</td>
<td>讚好：5 回應 (正面)：0 回應 (負面)：0</td>
<td>這個狀態是關於青少年甲與朋友到密室梯逃玩耍的體驗。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![圖像](圖像連結)

標籤：分享自己的生活

- 有條理地整理資料
- 歸納Facebook溝通活動的特點 (P.9)

焦點問題

1. 此回應統計只包括青少年甲、乙、丙的朋友的留言回應，青少年甲、乙、丙的留言回覆則不會計算在內。下同。
從以上的資料可見，青少年在 Facebook 平台上與朋友分享生活瑣事（包括狀態、趣聞、影片、歌曲、圖片等）與交流互動（主要是讚好及正面的回應）。當中的溝通活動可歸納出以下特點：

- 可引入多些考慮層面，使探究更全面
樣本7

### 判斷及論證

表一：

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. 分享生活</th>
<th>青少年甲</th>
<th>青少年乙</th>
<th>青少年丙</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>兩個月內其中四個狀態的讚好總數：</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>兩個月內其中四個狀態的回應總數：</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>朋友的留言對促進青少年與朋友的社交關係造成正面或負面的影響：</td>
<td>正面：23</td>
<td>正面：12</td>
<td>正面：3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>負面：0</td>
<td>負面：0</td>
<td>負面：1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
樣本7

• 判斷及論證

讚好和回應的數量也以這類狀態最多。其中包括日常活動 (甲狀態 1 和 4; 乙 1–4; 丙 1–4)、憂慮 (甲 2)、感想 (乙 4、丙 4)，而這類狀態也吸引最多朋友回應。例如甲的狀態 4 中，她向朋友發布自己旅遊的近況，主動向朋友分享自己的喜悅；而朋友們亦留言祝福青少年甲有愉快的旅程，這顯示了青少年與朋友透過網絡，即使不是直接見面也能在 Facebook 這平台上顯出善意、正面的交流，從而維繫及促進社交關係。

• 嘗試以資料論證
樣本7

判斷及論證

提供意見，促進雙方的交流，體現了青少年與朋友的互相幫助。例如朋友在留言通知青少年甲他的朋友有意想購買，這種網上售貨在 Facebook 平台上很常見，這個個案反映青少年與朋友間實質的互助。(甲 2) 另外朋友也在青少年甲因放榜而困惑時提出支持，屬情感的互助關係，對人際關係有促進作用。(甲 3)

以上對話顯示青少年可透過 Facebook 的平台分享自己的生活，朋友作出提議和求助，青少年可回應朋友，達至「互助」的元素。不過，從青少年甲、乙、丙的塗鴉墻可見，像上例般透過 Facebook 在網上放售課本或其他求助的情況並不常見。甚至有時青少年分享困惑時也不一定得到回應。(甲 7) 可見在 Facebook 平台上體現互助的情況只屬一般。

• 嘗試以資料論證

• 講點欠清晰
三．「互信」元素

加上 Facebook 是個公開透明的社交網站，沒有任何資訊的發報是保證完全私隱。因此青少年大多不敢在 Facebook 表露自己真實的負面情緒和擔憂，是青少年對在 Facebook 分享憂慮的信心下跌，反映了具「互信」元素的 Facebook 狀態的數量和情況亦相對較少。因此 Facebook 未能有效地促進和發揮「互信」的元素。
解釋和論證

- 在C部分，清楚整理資料，也能歸納Facebook溝通活動的特點。但可更深入討論這議題的爭議點（如對使用Facebook的正面及負面看法），引入多些考慮層面，使探究更全面。
- 從不同向度（正面積極、互助及互信）利用分析Facebook的資料，討論Facebook的狀態及回應與社交關係。嘗試以理論與探究結果互相引證（與P.11），但欠解說。
- 主要分析Facebook的狀態與回應（如讚好），未有考慮其他有關Facebook的功能與使用的影響。
- 探究方法有創意，但未有深入探討Facebook是否促進社交關係，特別是就「互信」的探討欠理據。
- 總括來說，分析架構較弱，論證可否促進社交關係的準則不明確。
## 評分指引

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>表現水平 （分數）</th>
<th>表達與組織 （比重:1）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>表現滿意 （4 – 6分）</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>運用尚算有用的資料, 但或資料份量不足, 也或與沒有清晰地把資料與分析及論證連繫起來</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>簡單解釋因素／影響／關係／主要持份者的看法、動態關係／分歧／議題隱含的價值觀, 但欠清晰, 也不深入; 運用基本／非完全相關的概念及知識／事實／或不準確及／或過時的資料</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>運用非完全相關的概念及知識／事實／或不準確及／或過時的資料來論證考生的立場／選擇／決定, 在部分地方發現邏輯推理有誤及理據欠充份</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>提供與議題有關的意見／觀點, 並輔以尚算有力的論據</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>就回應議題所作的分析, 其範疇及深度均見局限, 當中有欠詳盡的地方／傾向單一／集中某些角度</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
表達與組織

- 清楚展示及分析Facebook資料
- 清楚註明資料來源
- 有條理地論證觀點，但D部的組織和結構較鬆散
表達與組織
（比重:1）

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>表現水平（分數）#</th>
<th>表現滿意（4 – 6分）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 以連貫和一致的結構，簡明及有條理地傳意</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 有效使用資料（例如以照片、圖、表及數據資料等形式的資料）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 清楚和準確註明資料來源</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>By July 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| S5     | September 2013 | Schools to provide the following information to the HKEAA:  
|        |               | • Names and relevant information of S5 IES teachers  
|        | March – May 2014 | • Students to submit the Project Proposal Stage Tasks to their IES teachers by March 2014  
|        |               | • Teachers to hold within-school standardisation meeting(s) and mark the Project Proposal Stage Tasks from March to April 2014  
|        |               | • The S5 ‘Task’ mark of Project Proposal Stage to be properly kept by the school.  

| S6       | September 2014 | Schools to provide the following information to the HKEAA:  
|          |               | • Names and relevant information of S6 IES teachers |
| November 2014 – January 2015 | • Students to submit the Product Stage Tasks to their IES teachers by November 2014*  
|          |               | • Teachers to hold within-school standardisation meeting(s) and mark the Product Stage Tasks from November 2014 to December 2014  
|          |               | • Schools to submit students’ ‘Process’ marks and ‘Task’ marks of Project Proposal and Product to the HKEAA in January 2015  
|          |               | • Schools to submit the Product Stage Tasks for sample review to the HKEAA in January 2015 (2-23 Jan 2015) |
| July 2015 | Release of 2015 HKDSE Examination Results |
| October 2015 | Schools to receive feedback on the outcome of moderation |
Thank You