

## 2023 NCEA Assessment Report

<b>Subject:</b>	Social Studies
<b>Level:</b>	Level 2
<b>Achievement standard(s):</b>	91279, 91281

### General commentary

Overall, candidates demonstrated a good understanding of cultural conflict. The responses showed variability in the proficient use and description of social studies' points-of-view, values, and perspectives. It was more common for detailed descriptions of perspectives to be used for 91281, where responses are more prepared than in 91279, where perspectives are applied to the resources provided.

### Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

##### Assessment

The examination required candidates to respond to a task, using specific evidence / examples from the resources provided about alcohol advertising in sport and relevant social studies concepts.

##### Commentary

Overall, candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the conflict depicted in the resources provided. However, there were perspectives provided inaccurately, e.g. assertions that an individual had a public health perspective when that may not be the case. There were also perspectives identified, which did not align with the values described, e.g. candidates described a person with a conservative perspective who values change and the breaking of traditions. Candidates who focused on the resources rather than the social force depicted in the resource, e.g. stating "Resource C contributed to the conflict by ..." did not clearly show an understanding of social forces.

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified accurately the points of view and perspectives of the individuals / groups involved in the conflict
- used relevant values in describing these points of view and perspectives
- described the conflict by showing two differing views on alcohol advertising in the sports industry
- supported descriptions with specific evidence
- described the social forces without explaining how they contributed to the conflict.

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

- identified and described accurately the relevant social forces provided in the resource booklet and explained how the social force contributed to the conflict, using evidence
- demonstrated understanding of how the social forces contributed to the conflict, making statements such as “worsened”, “intensified”, “gained further support for ... ”
- went beyond the information provided and applied what they had read to the concept of cultural conflict.

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

- stated which social force was most likely to solve the conflict and gave well-supported reasons for their chosen social force in a manner that explored the relative effects of both social forces
- chose to explore the effects of both social forces and used this as a basis to assert which social force was most likely to solve the conflict
- used examples / evidence from the resources to support their assertions.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- gave inaccurate descriptions of the points of view, values, and perspectives of people involved
  - described a point of view without including relevant values or perspectives
  - summarised the information given in the resources without directly answering the examination question
  - gave their own opinions on the cultural conflict and what should be done to solve it without answering the task.
-

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

### Assessment

The examination required candidates to respond to a task, using a studied cultural conflict, relevant social studies concepts, and specific evidence.

### Commentary

Overall, candidates showed a strong understanding of a cultural conflict and were well prepared for the requirements of the standard. However, some chosen contexts made it difficult for candidates to effectively respond to parts of the examination question. This was common where a social issue was described without explaining clearly what the conflict was relating to the social issue. For example, using the topic of 'children's rights' without unpacking the conflicting ideas around the issue of children's rights, or what was the best way to support / defend these rights.

### Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- described the focus of the cultural conflict(s) as well as the individual(s) / group(s) / society(ies) involved (including points of view, values, and perspectives)
- described the factors which shape the way the conflict(s) was / were addressed
- described at least one way of addressing the conflict
- described outcomes but did not support them with evidence
- described outcomes that did not clearly align to the way(s) of addressing the conflict(s).

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

- described possible outcomes of the conflict, supporting them with evidence
- described more than one way of addressing the conflict but did not attempt to give a recommendation
- gave a recommendation that lacked specifics of how it would meet the desired outcome for society or how it would help address the conflict, e.g. stating the best outcome would be "UN intervention" without stating what that intervention would be and how / why it would work.

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

- explained the specifics behind their recommendation
- used evidence to justify their recommendation
- connected the recommendation to the desired outcomes for society.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- gave points of view without including a description of values and perspectives
- identified a perspective but used irrelevant or inappropriate values when unpacking the chosen perspective
- described a social issue rather than a conflict
- described hypothetical contexts
- did not support key ideas with evidence.