



New Zealand Qualifications Authority
Mana Tohu Matauranga O Aotearoa

Home > NCEA > Subjects > Assessment Reports > Social Studies - L2

Assessment Report

Level 2 Social Studies 2016

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

Part A: Commentary

Many candidates were well prepared and demonstrated a thorough understanding of key Social Studies ideas.

Some candidates attempted only the parts of the question that related to the 'Achievement' criteria, which did not enable the marker to give holistic consideration to the response. This meant any insufficiencies prevented some candidates from gaining an Achievement grade.

Part B: Report on Standards

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

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- described the nature and cause of the conflict, consistently supporting main points with specific evidence
- described the points of view, values and perspectives on the conflict accurately
- identified the social forces of the conflict without describing how these forces contributed to the conflict.

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

- copied large portions of text from the resource book without relating information to the questions
- did not include specific evidence to support main ideas
- gave points of view and/or values on the conflict but did not demonstrate understanding of relevant perspectives
- did not demonstrate understanding of the nature and cause of the conflict.

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

- described the social forces and gave some suggestion of how each force contributed to the conflict
- supported their ideas with specific evidence.

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

- gave evaluative statements regarding the effects of the social forces involved; either to compare the social forces in terms of influence or to suggest the extent a social force affected the conflict
- supported main ideas with evidence or strongly related evaluative statements to the conflict provided in the resource booklet.

Standard-specific comments

Some candidates struggled to link a point of view to a perspective accurately. Some could give a detailed description of the values of the people involved but gave perspectives that did not accurately reflect the same values. For example, they could describe a person as valuing freedom of choice but as holding a public health perspective.

The description of a person's point of view, values and perspective(s) could also be undermined by a poor choice of quotation that contradicts what the candidate has described.

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

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- used relevant specific evidence to support key points consistently throughout their response
- gave points of view and values of the groups/individuals involved in the conflict and link this to a relevant perspective
- identified outcomes without describing how the ways of addressing the conflict related to the outcomes
- identified outcomes without supporting key ideas with specific evidence.

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

- gave incomplete answers that did not directly address the question
- gave unclear perspectives of the people involved in the conflict
- wrote a general narrative of a conflict without using specific evidence or concepts
- used limited or no specific evidence throughout the response.

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

- demonstrated a strong understanding of the conflict through a detailed description
- gave a detailed description of the outcomes and how they have arisen from the way the conflict has been addressed, rather than outcomes from the conflict itself
- gave accurate and consistent specific evidence throughout their response.

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

- suggested ways of addressing the conflict using evidence and linking their suggestions back to the conflict at hand, rather than giving generic ways to solve a conflict
- demonstrated understanding of key aspects of the conflict that led to some ways of addressing the conflict being more suitable than others
- included reasoned argument of why they selected particular ways of addressing the conflict.

Standard-specific comments

Some topics used were historical and restricted students in making insightful recommendations of how to address a conflict as it has already been resolved to some extent. Candidates tended to perform better when explaining on-going conflicts.

Some candidates wrote overly lengthy responses that included repetition of main points and/or giving numerous examples to support main ideas rather than a carefully chosen, well developed few.

[Social Studies subject page](#)

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority