

**Assessment Schedule – 2018****Social Studies: Demonstrate understanding of conflict(s) arising from different cultural beliefs and ideas (91279)****Assessment Criteria**

| <b>Achievement</b>  | <b>Achievement with Merit</b>   | <b>Achievement with Excellence</b>  |
|---|---|---|
| <u>Demonstrate understanding involves:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• using social studies concepts and giving specific evidence to describe:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the nature and cause(s) of the conflict(s)</li> <li>- the points of view, values and perspectives of the individuals / groups involved in the conflict.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <u>Demonstrate in-depth understanding involves:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explaining how social forces contribute to the conflict(s).</li> </ul> | <u>Demonstrate comprehensive understanding involves:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• evaluating the relative effect(s) of social forces on the conflict(s).</li> </ul> |

**Evidence**

| <b>A3</b>  | <b>A4</b>   | <b>M5</b>  | <b>M6</b>   | <b>E7</b>  | <b>E8</b>   |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| <p>Gives a limited or partial description of the nature and causes of the conflict(s) using the points of view, values, and perspectives of the individuals / groups involved.</p> <p>Uses specific evidence.</p>  | <p>Describes, in detail, the nature and causes of the conflict(s) using the points of view, values, and perspectives of the individuals / groups involved.</p> <p>Uses specific evidence.</p> | <p>Gives a limited or partial explanation of how TWO social forces contribute to the conflict(s).</p> <p>Uses specific evidence.</p> | <p>Explains, in detail, how TWO social forces contribute to the conflict(s).</p> <p>Uses specific evidence.</p> | <p>Gives a limited or partial evaluation of the relative effect(s) of these social forces on the conflict(s), and which social force is most likely to resolve the conflict(s).</p> <p>Uses specific evidence.</p> | <p>Evaluates comprehensively the relative effect(s) of these social forces on the conflict(s), and which social force is most likely to resolve the conflict(s).</p> <p>Uses specific evidence.</p> |
| <p>See <b>Appendix</b> for sample evidence.</p> <p><b>N0</b> = No response; no relevant evidence.<br/> <b>N1</b> = Attempts a relevant response for an aspect(s) of the task (may be a sentence or two).<br/> <b>N2</b> = Attempts to describe cultural conflict(s).</p> |   |  |   |  |   |

**Cut Scores**

| <b>Not Achieved</b> | <b>Achievement</b> | <b>Achievement with Merit</b> | <b>Achievement with Excellence</b> |
|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 0 – 2               | 3 – 4              | 5 – 6                         | 7 – 8                              |

## Appendix – Sample Evidence

Note: Plain text denotes Achievement evidence; underlined text is for *Merit*; and *italics* is for *Excellence*.

| Task | Expected Coverage (not limited to these examples)  |
|------|--|
| (a)  | <p><b>Identifies and describes the nature and causes of the conflict surrounding the issue of freedom camping in New Zealand, e.g.:</b></p> <p>This conflict is between those that believe freedom camping is damaging our natural environment and should have their behaviour restricted by by-laws and laws, and those that see the value of freedom campers to the tourist industry.</p> <p>One study showed that in Queenstown in 2009, rubbish was left behind at 98 per cent of sites, and 16 per cent had evidence of human waste. Pollution such as this has led to people believing that freedom camping should be controlled or restricted in some way.</p> <p>People also disagree over the economic value / benefit of freedom campers. Some believe that freedom campers make a great contribution to our economy through the activities that they pay to do during their stay, whereas others think this benefit is eroded by ratepayers having to pay for extra facilities and cleaning up rubbish after their stay. The Rodney District Council Chair said “Ratepayers are losing out twice. They are paying for enforcement and work on the public toilets, while at the same time losing revenue from council-owned campgrounds, such as the one on Orewa Beach”.</p>  |
| (b)  | <p><b>Identifies the individuals / groups in the conflict, and describes their values and perspectives, e.g.:</b></p> <p>From an environmentalist perspective, a McKenzie District Community Board Member, believes that freedom campers have a negative impact on the environment. She states “You can have 70 campervans on one site, and a local resident has said he's seen them going to the toilet in the tussocks”. She values protecting the physical environment of the area and controlling the damage done by freedom campers.</p> <p>From a capitalist perspective, the Christchurch Kiwi Holiday Park and Motels owner believes freedom camping has a negative impact on his ability as a business to make a profit. He loses revenue, as campers prefer to stay at a nearby free camping site, and have been caught sneaking in to use the holiday park's free showers. He states “ ... our showers and toilets are not locked, and we can't afford security, so people could be coming in at all hours of the night”.</p>   |
| (c)  | <p><b>Identifies and explains TWO social forces contributing to the conflict, using specific evidence, e.g.:</b></p> <p>(1) Legislation</p> <p><u>Legislation is a social force that has contributed to the conflict. In some ways, legislation, in the form of by-laws, has been made in reaction to community complaints. Councils have made rules to restrict the activities of campers. For example, the Christchurch City Council has banned all non-self-contained camping, but allowed campers who have self-contained vehicles (equipped with their own facilities, particularly toilets) in some areas. This has meant, according to the City Council's Chief Executive, “There has been a noticeable reduction in the number of complaints received in relation to freedom camping. The number of non-compliant campers to date is approximately half, compared with the same period last year”. In some cases, this has lessened the conflict, as locals can see the council taking action to solve the problem, however in other cases, legislation has worsened the problem. This is because freedom campers are reacting in a negative way when approached by enforcement.</u></p> <p>(2) Nationalism</p> <p><u>The social force of nationalism has worsened the cultural conflict. Nationalism relates to the idea that many New Zealanders see camping as a national pastime – a key to our identity – and tourists who damage the environment could be spoiling the outdoors experience for all. This has worsened the conflict because it has meant locals are now taking actions against freedom campers themselves. In Taranaki, local surfers have confronted campers about their behaviour, even instructing them to move on from the carpark they are camping in. A veteran surfer from Australia, said “Man ... they are quite a vitriolic lot at these surfing spots. I think they make matters worse by being confrontational. If they educated in a chilled way, there would be a lot more buy in”.</u></p> |

|     |   |
|-----|---|
| (d) | <p><b>Evaluates the relative effects of these TWO social forces on the conflict, using specific evidence, e.g.:</b></p> <p><i>Legislation is the social force that has the greatest impact on this conflict. It is the most likely way to change the undesired behaviour of freedom campers. This is because freedom campers are often choosing to experience New Zealand in the least costly way. If legislation or by-laws are passed, and enforced with fines, freedom camping could become more costly. It could be a strong deterrent for campers to engage in undesirable behaviours. Fining campers that ruin the environment could also resolve the conflict between locals and the councils, as it will show that the councils have listened to the complaints of ratepayers, and are prepared to take action to address the issue. As previously mentioned, the Christchurch City Council has experienced a noticeable reduction in the number of complaints since introducing by-laws to clamp down on freedom campers. This would also address one of the arguments that ratepayers should not be financially burdened to address the issue of freedom campers, as fines could go towards upgrading amenities. As Prime Minister, Jacinda Ardern, states “I don't think every New Zealander should be paying to install extra dunnies for freedom campers”.</i></p> |
|-----|---|