

## Assessment Report

# Level 2 Social Studies 2017

Standards [91279](#) [91281](#)

### Part A: Commentary

Overall, candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of the requirements of both standards. Many gave answers that showed a higher level of thinking with insightful commentary. These candidates went beyond formulaic responses and expressed a mature consideration of relevant cultural conflict(s).

### Part B: Report on standards

#### **91279: Demonstrate understanding of conflict(s) arising from different cultural beliefs and ideas**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated a good understanding of the material provided in the resource booklet
- inferred relevant values and points of view to develop well explained perspectives of individuals / groups involved
- identified the issue and gave an accurate description of the nature and cause of the conflict
- used specific evidence to support statements.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not clearly identify and describe the conflict
- used little or no specific evidence to support statements and ideas
- gave insufficient or inaccurate points of view, values and perspectives of individuals / groups
- used values that were inconsistent / at odds with the perspectives used when describing the points of view, values and perspectives of individuals / groups. For example, stating someone had an environmental perspective and then explaining this as valuing profit
- copied large portions of the resource booklet without addressing the exam question.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- used the material provided to give supporting evidence throughout their response
- identified accurately two social forces that contributed to the conflict
- explained the social forces, giving reasons of why / how they contributed to the conflict.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- read and processed the material provided to demonstrate a synthesised argument
- used detailed specific evidence consistently throughout their response
- evaluated the relative effect of each social force in a manner that demonstrated a higher level of thinking. For example, these candidates gave well-supported statements that showed evaluative thought such as ‘the most influential social force was.... because...’ or made comparative statements about the effect of the social forces on the conflict.

#### **Standard specific comments**

Candidates used the resource booklet well but some were not able to understand the points of view of individuals given and devise statements that accurately described the values and perspectives of these individuals.

Candidates that provided strong responses provided quotes, facts, details from the resources provided throughout their response to support their main ideas without copying large portions of the text.

---

### **91281: Describe how cultural conflict(s) can be addressed**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- gave well-structured responses that addressed the question
- used specific evidence to support their statements
- identified outcomes but did not give a detailed explanation and supporting evidence
- did not show understanding of how the conflict caused the outcome
- supported the description of the factors involved with an explanation of how each factor shaped the conflict.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- gave a detailed description of the historical background to the conflict without directly addressing the question
- provided little / no evidence to support their statements
- included irrelevant material
- lacked a clear description of some aspects of the question
- gave factors which shape the way the conflict is addressed but did not provide the ways of addressing the conflict or vice versa.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- presented detailed responses to each question
- supported key ideas and assertions with specific evidence consistently throughout their response
- described the outcomes of the conflict in a manner that showed how the conflict caused the outcome, rather than simply labelling / identifying outcomes
- recommended ways of addressing the conflict but did not provide a robust, reasoned argument of why they had made their recommendations
- gave recommendations that lacked description and / or supporting evidence.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- gave a reasoned argument to support their recommendations and linked this to desired outcomes for society

- used specific and detailed evidence when giving recommendations to validate their ideas or show how their recommendation may work
- were insightful in understanding of conflict and solutions and recommendations were balanced and thoughtful.

### **Standard specific comments**

Some candidates recalled a great deal of information about a conflict but did not directly address the question or provided general narratives of the conflict without using key terms, such as 'factors', 'outcomes'. Candidates who have studied historical rather than current cultural conflict(s) were more likely to do this.

Other candidates had studied contemporary conflicts that are currently being discussed in our world. This led to candidates giving original and insightful commentaries when describing recommendations of how the conflict could be addressed.

## **Social Studies subject page**

### **Previous years' reports**

[2016 \(PDF, 0KB\)](#)

---

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority