

## Assessment Schedule – 2025

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

#### Assessment Criteria

Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
The candidate identifies a cultural conflict they have studied.		
<p><i>Describe how cultural conflict(s) can be addressed</i> involves using <b>social studies concepts</b> and giving <b>specific evidence</b> to describe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focus of cultural conflict(s)</li> <li>the individual(s) / group(s) / society(ies) involved in the conflict and their points of view, values, and perspectives</li> <li>the way(s) of addressing the conflict(s).</li> </ul>	<p><i>Describe, in depth, how cultural conflict(s) can be addressed</i> involves describing possible outcomes arising from ways of addressing the conflict(s).</p>	<p><i>Describe comprehensively how cultural conflict(s) can be addressed</i> involves recommending a way of addressing the conflict(s) to achieve the desired outcomes for society.</p>

#### Evidence

A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
<p>Gives a description of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focus of the cultural conflict</li> <li>the individual(s) / group(s) / society(ies) involved in the conflict and their points of view, values, and perspectives</li> <li>how a local intervention has been used to address the cultural conflict.</li> </ul> <p>Uses specific evidence.</p>	<p>Describes, in depth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focus of the cultural conflict</li> <li>the individual(s) / group(s) / society(ies) involved in the conflict and their points of view, values, and perspectives</li> <li>how a local intervention has been used to address the cultural conflict.</li> </ul> <p>Uses specific evidence.</p>	<p>Describes TWO possible outcomes arising from local intervention that have attempted to address the conflict.</p> <p>Uses specific evidence.</p>	<p>Describes, in depth, TWO possible outcomes arising from local intervention that have attempted to address the conflict.</p> <p>Uses specific evidence.</p>	<p>Compares the type of interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>global</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>local</li> </ul> <p>to recommend which best addresses the cultural conflict and is <i>most</i> likely to achieve the desired outcomes for society.</p> <p>Uses sound reasoning and specific evidence.</p>	<p>Compares, comprehensively, the type of interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>global</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>local</li> </ul> <p>to recommend which best addresses the cultural conflict and is <i>most</i> likely to achieve the desired outcomes for society.</p> <p>Uses sound reasoning specific evidence.</p>
<p>See <b>Appendix</b> for sample evidence.</p>					
<p><b>N2</b> = Attempts to describe several aspects of the task; minimal, insufficient evidence is used to support the main ideas.  <b>N1</b> = Attempts a relevant response for an aspect(s) of the task (may be a sentence or two).  <b>N0</b> = No response; no relevant evidence.</p>					

#### Cut Scores

Not Achieved	Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
0–2	3–4	5–6	7–8

**Appendix – Sample Evidence**

<b>Expected Coverage (not limited to these examples)</b>
Task: With reference to a <b>cultural conflict</b> studied, the candidate describes:
<p><b>The focus of a cultural conflict, e.g.:</b>                  President Trump’s immigration policies.</p>
<p><b>The individual(s) / group(s) / society(ies) involved in the conflict and their points of view, values, and perspectives, e.g.:</b>                  Points of view and values are described using relevant perspectives, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Humanitarian</li> <li>• Democratic</li> <li>• Nationalist</li> <li>• Economic.</li> </ul>
<p><b>How a local intervention has attempted to address the cultural conflict and TWO possible outcomes arising from this, e.g.:</b></p> <p>As Donald Trump begins his second term as US President, he has quickly enacted several immigration policies at the centre of a political conflict in the US, including the deportation of unlawful migrants, strengthening the US-Mexico border, expanding the powers of US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to arrest and detain unlawful migrants, ending birthright citizenship, and stopping the processing of migrants under the ‘remain in Mexico’ policy. The President deployed 1,500 troops to the US-Mexico border in the early days of his second term and 1,000 people were removed by the fourth day of his administration.</p> <p>President Trump’s actions have sparked both local and global interventions to address the conflict. These interventions have sought to end or restrict the immigration policies, or to minimise the negative impacts of the policies on the people affected to address the conflict.</p> <p>Local interventions in the US have involved either legal action or direct social action.</p> <p>Legal action has been undertaken by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and several immigrant rights groups have filed lawsuits against aspects of Trump’s immigration policies, namely his wanting to get rid of birthright citizenship (the right to stay in the US legally if you were born there, regardless of your parents’ immigration status). Trump’s reversal of this right has been deemed unconstitutional and is currently paused due to legal proceedings. Within the first month of Trump’s second term, four executive orders had been temporarily blocked due to legal action. For example, the ACLU has led immigrant rights groups to court to argue that individuals have the right to seek asylum, and, on 20 February 2025, a federal judge imposed an emergency hold while more information was gathered.</p> <p>Another form of local intervention is the direct social actions undertaken to address the conflict. Large protests have taken place throughout many US states, some church leaders have spoken out against the treatment of immigrants, and in some cases, have offered sanctuary to those at risk of deportation. Other groups have offered support and advice to immigrants seeking asylum. For example, the Civil Liberties Defense Center runs ‘Know your Rights’ education training programmes to enable people to advocate for migrants impacted on by ICE raids.</p> <p><u>Possible outcomes</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) One of the possible outcomes of legal action is overturning Trump’s executive orders or forcing him to change them. This was the case in his first term, when he attempted to enforce travel bans from largely Muslim countries. Due to successive legal challenges, the policy was amended three times before it was enacted. While legal challenges were unable to completely stop the ‘Muslim ban’ policy (2017), it did force the policy to be amended. It is therefore possible that the legal action made in response to Trump’s 2025 immigration policies could deem aspects of his executive orders illegal and require amendments.</li> <li>(2) One of the possible outcomes of direct social action, such as large-scale protests, lobbying, and advocating against the immigration policies is that Trump could abandon certain migration policies if he realises that there is strong opposition to them. In his last term, Trump did back down on his migration policy that saw families separated at the border. Images of traumatised children being taken off their parents helped to create a strong backlash from the public. In June 2018, Trump reversed his own policy stating, “I did not like the sight of families being separated”.</li> </ol>

AND compares:

**Local and global interventions to recommend which best addresses the cultural conflict and is *most likely to achieve the desired outcomes for society, using specific evidence, e.g.:***

The desired outcome for society is for the US government and President Trump to devise immigration policy that ensures the human rights of the people involved. This would require intervention to get Trump to change his policies. Based on past scenarios where Trump has backtracked on policy, there are two key reasons why local intervention is the most effective way to address this conflict.

Firstly, local interventions have influenced Trump's decision-making in his previous administration, as US citizens have more power in this situation than any people / country / group involved in global interventions. In January 2025, the Colombian government attempted to take a stand against Trump's deportation policies, refusing to allow two US planes of deportees to land in Colombia. Trump responded quickly, threatening to raise tariffs on Colombian imports from 25% to 50%, causing a back down from the Colombian president. Due to the wealth and trading power of the US, many nations are not in the position to challenge and change Trump's position. Trump is tough with his immigration stance, as it pleases his voter base. Therefore, it is his supporters who hold more power to change his approach.

The second reason why local interventions are more likely to achieve the desired outcomes for society is because of legal jurisdiction. Globally, organisations can denounce Trump's policies and not cooperate with him, but there are limited legal means to stop his actions. Many countries around the world are accused of human rights violations, yet there are few that are addressed through international law. Comparatively, local US legal proceedings can have more of an impact in addressing this conflict, as government checks and balances make it difficult for a president to enact unconstitutional policy without lengthy and costly delay. For example, should the Supreme Court deem a policy unconstitutional, the president cannot override this decision and would have to amend the Constitution with the support of Congress.

Therefore, the best way to address the conflict in President Trump's immigration policies is local intervention, using legal action and lobbying to encourage or force Trump to change his migration policies to protect the human rights of migrants and refugees. Specifically, a continuation of court actions by groups like the ACLU, taking cases to the Supreme Court to prove policies, such as removing birthright citizenship are unconstitutional. This would force the policy to end. Also, Trump has a history of backtracking on policies proven to have a negative impact on a large group of Americans or the economy. Lobbying by groups that would traditionally vote Republican would be more likely to persuade him to change his immigration policies. One example is lobby groups from the agriculture sector. Many US farmers are hugely concerned with the impacts a crackdown on undocumented / illegal migrants will have as over 50% of farm workers are migrants, so this would detrimentally impact their workforce. It may also lead to increases in food prices for all Americans. Strategic lobbying by farming groups and an outcry from people feeling the pinch of increased food prices would be more likely to convince Trump to change his approach to immigration than criticism from the global community.