

National Certificate of Educational Achievement

2012 Assessment Report

Health Level 3

- 90709 Analyse an international health issue**
- 90711 Explain a contemporary dilemma or ethical issue in relation to well-being.**
- 90712 Examine models of health promotion and their implications for well-being**

COMMENTARY

This was the final year for examinations to assess these achievement standards.

Increasingly Level 3 Health candidates are using appropriate resource material in their responses, as well as providing appropriate evidence of their own.

The evidence that candidates provide in their responses must be current, accurate and relevant.

Successful candidates gave responses that were concise, and provided focused answers rather than providing general information.

STANDARD REPORTS

90709 Analyse an international health issue

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- explained two relevant factors and how they linked to the cultural, political and economic determinants of health (economic: education, employment; cultural: gender inequity, education; political: legislation or lack of, levels of corruption in some Sub Saharan African SSA countries)
- used valid supporting evidence
- showed some understanding of personal and societal implications in relation to the chosen factors
- explained several appropriate recommendations and linked these to the factors and determinants
- showed some understanding of equitable outcomes and social justice.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- explained factors but did not link them to the determinants of health (e.g. they identified factors such as education and poverty but made no links to economic, political or cultural determinants)
- did not provide any evidence or used evidence that was out of date or not referenced (e.g. statistics from 1993; “blue sheet given in class 2012”) or grossly inaccurate (“5.3% of the population have had HIV/AIDS at one time in their life”)
- focused only on personal and/or interpersonal implications and/or failed to consider the wider societal implications
- suggested recommendations that did not reflect social justice (e.g. harsher punishments) or that were vague ideas rather than possible actions (e.g. “putting up posters around SSA”, “building free pharmacies around SSA” and “using volunteers to clean up SSA and paying them with a hot meal”)
- showed little or no understanding of health concepts and terms.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- explained in depth valid influencing factors and linked them to a specific determinant of health
- provided relevant, current and accurate supporting evidence
- provided an in depth analysis of the implications and made clear links to the determining factors in questions 1(a) and 2(a)
- explained appropriate recommendations for action that linked to the determining factors and demonstrated understanding of social justice and human rights.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- comprehensively explained the two most relevant factors contributing to the health issue
- provided a wide range of accurate supporting evidence from credible sources
- perceptively analysed the most critical implications and made strong links to the determinants
- justified their recommendations with suggestions for action (ie who should do this and how (often with evidence) and clearly explained how they could lead to equitable outcomes
- demonstrated a high level of understanding of the complexity of the situation and the interrelationships between the determining factors
- considered the entire issue (e.g. economic: recommending the World Bank reduce or cancel the debts carried by many Sub Saharan African countries, freeing and redirecting government funding into education and teacher training including sexuality education, removing costs to parents which would enable all children to attend primary school).

OTHER COMMENTS

The international health issue under discussion was HIV transmission and living with HIV and AIDS. The issue was not AIDS transmission per se. Many responses provided inaccurate and misleading statistics, particularly with the HIV topic. For example, in some papers candidates wrote about HIV in South East Asia or the South Pacific but did not make their descriptions specific to those areas, instead using statistical evidence relating to Sub Saharan African countries.

Many candidates made the assumption that HIV rates are still increasing, whereas in most countries the rates, although still significant, are decreasing. This suggests candidates are using outdated resources as there was little or no recognition of the work being carried out in sub Saharan African countries (e.g. increased rates of testing and anti-retroviral treatment).

Another common focus was homosexuality and injecting drug users. In SSA, heterosexual sex is still the main mode of transmission of HIV.

Other topics were attempted. This is encouraging, yet it is recommended that candidates understand the nature of the determinants of health in relation to the topics they select, (e.g. in transactional nutrition, colonisation and globalisation are not determinants of health, but must be linked to economic, cultural and political factors).

Some candidates considered health issues, but limited their focus to New Zealand only when the standard requires an international focus. Cyber-bullying was discussed but candidates tended not to make convincing links to determinants of health or to geographical location.

Candidates are reminded to stay focused when answering the questions in the paper. Some candidates provided excessive information, writing up to 10 extra sides of paper, while others used valuable time rewriting the question.

Some candidates showed little understanding of the language of health education.

90711 Explain a contemporary dilemma or ethical issue in relation to well-being.

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- identified two different and opposing perspectives on the issue
- attempted to use some evidence or evidence-based thought, to support the responses, particularly for criteria one
- explained the attitudes, values, and beliefs of at least one group “for” and “against” the issue
- provided a balanced view of the issue
- explained implications for the well-being of individuals and society
- wrote about implications but their responses were brief and unclear in places.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- did not attempt all questions
- provided factually incorrect responses
- did not attempt to use the resource, evidence or evidence-based thought or did not acknowledge sources of evidence cited
- wrote on the wrong topic (or focused on an incorrect aspect, such as the ethics of AFT itself, rather than access to AFT)
- did not provide valid societal implications – often, the answer for “societal” was in fact focused on the well-being of individuals or others indirectly affected
- gave personal opinions, especially for the opposing perspectives.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- used accurate and detailed evidence and/or referenced the resource to support their explanation and consider implications
- provided responses where the perspectives were not too similar, allowing for more reasoned and clear explanations to be developed with little repetition between them
- made accurate links to the ethical principles at stake and showed some understanding of ethical issues
- identified societal impacts that were clearly and meaningfully related to culture and/or opportunities for health promotion
- presented responses that encompassed short-term and long-term and positive and negative considerations.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- selected the most significant groups for the “for” and “against” perspectives
- explained a range of health-related attitudes, beliefs and values for each group in both the opposing and supporting perspectives
- provided reasoned explanations, well supported by factually accurate evidence
- showed a clear understanding of the ethical nature of the issue
- accurately linked the perspectives and groups to the relevant ethical principles in the resource (and/or other ethical principles)
- demonstrated in their explanations a clear understanding of ethics
- explained impacts that were clearly focused on the implications arising from the
- in differing perspectives, showed understanding of the underlying concepts (hauora, attitudes and values, SEP, and health promotion) and the significance or importance of these.

OTHER COMMENTS

Exposure to SEM was also covered by a number of candidates. A significant number of the candidates who chose SEM or Parental rights and the treatment of children as their issue, focused on the attitudes, beliefs and values of individuals and/or specific events rather than the attitudes, beliefs and values of a group of people.

Parental rights and the treatment of children was the option least-often selected, and most candidates who attempted this option did not complete it well.

Overall, candidates who achieved higher grades provided balanced arguments and showed a greater understanding of the ethical issues involved, why their issue was an ethical dilemma, and who in society was “for” and/or “against” the issue.

90712 Examine models of health promotion and their implications for well-being

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- demonstrated understanding of the difference between collective action, behaviour change and self-empowerment
- explained how the NDI (National Depression Initiative) was using both the behaviour change and self-empowerment models
- explained the advantages and/or disadvantages of adding aspects of collective action to the NDI
- correctly linked at least one principle of the Ottawa or Bangkok Charters to the NDI goals
- explained possible implications for the well-being of individuals, families and society.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- quoted from the resource material but did not interpret (re-phrase) or examine the material in the context of the campaign
- confused collective action with behavioural change (e.g. Radio and TV advertisements)
- referred only to the goals of the NDI, ignoring the campaign components
- identified implications for individuals and families but not for society.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- provided clear and valid links between the campaign and the three models of Health Promotion
- re-phrased the resource material when linking the NDI to the Ottawa and Bangkok Charters
- explained the links between the NDI and the Health Promotion models by giving examples
- showed some understanding of the determinants of health in relation to depression
- explained short and long-term implications for individuals, families and society.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- showed a high level of conceptual understanding of the three models of health promotion
- demonstrated understanding that collective action is required for long-term sustainable health changes

- recognised that there are factors outside the control of individuals, such as the determinants of health in relation to mental health/depression
- clearly understood that 'creating supportive environments' is about changing societal attitudes towards mental illness/depression
- included critical and insightful implications for the well-being of individuals, families and society.