

2024 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Social Studies
Level:	2
Achievement standard(s):	91279, 91281

General commentary

Overall, successful candidates demonstrated a strong understanding of cultural conflict(s), directly answered the bullet points outlining the assessment task, and supported their responses with relevant specific evidence. However, in both standards, the use of perspectives was variable. A lack of cohesion between points of view, values, and perspectives was evident in some responses.

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 the role of the British monarchy in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Commentary

Overall, candidates showed an understanding of the key aspects of the conflict presented in the resource booklet. However, some candidates did not use the points of view provided in the resource material to demonstrate understanding of the values and perspectives involved. Some responses also only summarised the information provided in each source, rather than explaining how the social forces contributed to the conflict.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- aligned perspectives and values correctly to the points of view shown in the resources
- used the information provided as specific evidence to support the main ideas throughout their response.

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

- gave descriptions of social forces that demonstrated an understanding of the way social forces shaped / contributed to the conflict
- used evidence to support their main ideas.

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

- used evaluative statements when exploring the relative effects of each social force
- gave reasoned argument in support of the social force most likely to resolve the conflict
- offered insightful commentary based on considering the conflict as a whole and / or applying their own knowledge to what they obtained from the resources, such as considering the more progressive nature of younger generations compared to older generations, or the economic implications of cutting ties with the monarchy.

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

- gave perspectives that were inconsistent with the values and / or points of view they chose
- did not demonstrate a clear understanding of what the conflict was about
- did not directly address 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. Candidates were specifically asked to describe how intervention using financial measures has attempted to address their chosen cultural conflict.

Commentary

Overall, candidates demonstrated a good understanding of a cultural conflict from their own studies. Many responses showed an in-depth knowledge of complex cultural conflicts from a variety of settings throughout the world. A few responses were based around historical topics, and it should be noted that this is not in keeping with the essence of this subject area. Responses that were largely hypothetical or overly narrative did not produce strong results.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- described the points of view, values, and perspectives of people or groups in a cohesive manner – the values used were consistent with the perspectives chosen when describing the points of view
- focused their response on intervention using financial measures
- gave theoretical outcomes and often did not support these outcomes with strong, specific evidence
- described outcomes that did not arise from intervention using financial measures.

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

- gave two clear outcomes arising from intervention using financial measures that were well described and supported with specific evidence
- recommended an intervention without detail or specific evidence to support how and why their recommendation would achieve the desired outcomes for society.

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

- gave a detailed description of their recommended way to address the cultural conflict, such as details about who would be involved and what they would do if mediation was chosen
- stated clearly what the desired outcome for society was
- gave specific evidence and examples to support their recommendation
- showed clear reasoning behind their chosen recommendation

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

- gave points of view without describing the values and / or perspectives that informed or shaped the points of view
- described interventions that did not include financial measures
- provided insufficient specific evidence throughout their response.