

Assessment Schedule – 2016

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

Evidence

Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
<p>The Candidate uses social studies concepts and specific evidence to:</p> <p>(a) Identify and describe the nature and causes of a conflict. The conflict between those who do not want water supplies to be fluoridated and those who think it is a good idea in the interest of public health.</p> <p>(b) Identify the individuals / groups in the conflict. <i>Examples of groups:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ministry of Health / Jonathan Coleman • Fluoride Free NZ • District Councils • Fluoride Action Network NZ • District Health Boards • Scientists / Relevant experts. <p><i>Examples of concepts:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Law • Freedom • Democracy • Choice • Values • Change • Roles and responsibilities. <p>The candidate describes the nature and cause of the conflict, including the points of view, values, and perspectives of the individuals / groups involved in the conflict. Responses should incorporate specific evidence to support ideas. <i>Example answer:</i> The conflict described in the resource booklet has arisen between people who think New Zealand should fluoridate water systems and those who don't. On one side of the argument, some people think it should happen because of the health benefits such as 18–40%</p>	<p>(c) The candidate identifies and explains TWO social forces contributing to the conflict. Social forces that contribute to the conflict could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campaigning • Scientific Evidence • Legislation. <p>The candidate is required to explain the social forces. This could involve giving reasons why or how the social force contributes to the conflict.</p> <p><i>An example of a social force – Campaigning:</i> Groups that have participated in social action campaigns have greatly contributed to the conflict by influencing people's beliefs around the issue of fluoridation. For example, Fluoride Free NZ have created Facebook pages, made films, protested, and published educational materials along with other social actions to persuade people to oppose fluoridation in the water system. They do this because they believe in personal freedom to choose whether you take medicine or not and because they believe that there are no health benefits to putting fluoride in water. This social force contributes to the conflict by increasing the number of people who disagree with fluoridation. This means local councils are more likely to listen to the anti-fluoride argument and make decisions based on what large groups of people want. For example, in 2015, Thames held a referendum on the issue and whilst the social action campaign did not stop fluoridation completely, the council acknowledged those who didn't want it and added an 'opt-out' policy for those people.</p>	<p>(d) The candidate evaluates the relative effects of the TWO social forces on the conflict. Candidates could demonstrate this by, for example, comparing and contrasting the social forces OR making generalisations in regards to the effectiveness of each social force.</p> <p><i>Example answer:</i> The relative effect of the two social forces campaigning and legislation are inherently tied up with the numbers of people involved.</p> <p>The social action campaigns have a huge effect on the conflict, as it encourages more people to become involved in the issue. Without the involvement of people, local councils and governments could make laws and rules that don't reflect the majority of the people. Water could be fluoridated without consideration of democratic process if there is not a loud and strong opposition campaign. These campaigns have also gained some victories, such as the overturning of fluoridation in New Plymouth and the introduction of the 'opt-out' policy in Thames.</p> <p>Whilst social action campaigns can strongly influence this conflict, legislation is what makes the final decision of which side of the debate "wins". The campaign could shape legislation, as the majority of people should be represented in the political process, however, fluoridation may not be an issue that people will sway their votes for. At a national level, the government can make legislation changes to support the introduction of fluoridation and make it easier to implement. For example, in January 2015, Health Minister Jonathan Coleman introduced legislation to amend the Medicines Regulations 1984 in a manner that would mean fluoride – when added to water supply – would not be classed as a 'medicine' and would not have to abide by the rules set out in the Medicines Act 1981.</p>

reduction in cavities when water is fluoridated. On the other hand, some people think that forcibly administering any type of medicine “ethically infringes on people’s rights to autonomy ... over their own body”. Central to this conflict are the concepts of freedom of the individual versus government responsibility to ensure the health of all people.

The cause of the conflict is the actions of local councils in deciding to fluoridate water without necessarily having the majority support of the people of their area. For example, The New Plymouth District Council voted to stop fluoridation of the water in 2011, as it became apparent that the majority didn’t want fluoridation. In fact, 400 submissions against fluoridation were received by the council during the decision-making process.

The Ministry of Health is a group that is involved in this conflict. Their role is to make recommendations for local councils on which the councils should base their decisions. The ministry has the responsibility to protect and promote health care in New Zealand. Ministry of Health chief dental officer Dr Robyn Haisman-Welsh believes that fluoridation is the most cost effective way to reduce poor dental health. She states “... it costs \$4.20 to prevent each case of tooth decay through water fluoridation, but it costs \$117 to treat each case of decay”. She has an economic perspective on the issue that values spending money in an efficient manner that gains results.

Another group that is involved in this conflict is Fluoride Free NZ. They are a social action group that aims to educate people about the disadvantages of fluoridation. They run high-profile campaigns and encourage people to take action against fluoridation. They state (fluoridation of water) “doesn’t work, is not safe, and it robs people of choice”. Fluoride Free NZ has a civil libertarian perspective on this issue that values people being able to make individual choices based on their personal belief rather than having governments making decisions on their behalf.

N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
Candidate attempts a relevant response for an aspect(s) of the task.	Candidate makes an attempt to describe cultural conflict(s).	Candidate gives limited or partial description of nature and causes of the conflict(s) using the points of view, values and perspectives of the individuals / groups involved. Candidate has used specific evidence.	Candidate fully describes the nature and causes of the conflict(s) using the points of view, values and perspectives of the individuals / groups involved. Candidate has used detailed and relevant specific evidence.	Candidate gives limited or partial explanation of how social forces contribute to the conflict(s). Candidate has used specific evidence.	Candidate explains in detail how social forces contribute to the conflict(s). Candidate has used detailed and relevant specific evidence.	Candidate gives partial or limited evaluation of the relative effect(s) of the social forces on the conflict(s). Candidate has used specific evidence.	Candidate comprehensively evaluates the relative effect(s) of the social forces on the conflict(s). Candidate has used detailed and relevant specific evidence.

N0 = No response; no relevant evidence.

Cut Scores

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