

National Certificate of Educational Achievement

2013 Assessment Report

Health Level 3

91462 Analyse an international health issue

91465 Evaluate models for health promotion

COMMENTARY

Candidates are showing a greater understanding of the application of the determinants of health to the various issues.

The number of candidates using the supplied resource material in their responses is increasing. The number of candidates making effective use of their own evidence is also increasing. Of concern is that a number of candidates are not providing research evidence that is current, accurate and relevant.

Candidates need to ensure their answers are concise, rather than providing a great deal of superfluous information that does not contribute to answering the question.

Candidates should ensure that they are not repeating information that they have already covered in previous parts of the paper. Repeated material is frequently neither concise nor coherent in relation to the question asked.

STANDARD REPORTS

91462 Analyse an international health issue

Successful candidates provided concise, focused answers rather than lengthy responses that demonstrated limited relevance to the question. Candidates are encouraged to read the question carefully and only provide relevant material in their response.

ACHIEVEMENT

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

- outlined a health issue which is causing international concern from the list of prescribed issues
- explained the influence of two of the major determinants of health (Cultural, Political & Economic) and how these were contributing to the issue
- showed an understanding of well being
- explained an understanding of relevant recommendations that related to the determinants of health, though the links may be loose
- recommended two strategies that addressed the chosen determinants of health. Strategies often addressed one determinant each
- recommended strategies which allowed for more equitable outcomes
- used some valid referenced evidence throughout the paper.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were awarded Not Achieved for this question lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They commonly:

- failed to attempt all parts of the paper
- failed to identify an issue of international concern from the list of prescribed issues.
- failed to link the most important determinants of health to their explanation of the influence on the issue

- focused predominately on the issue within New Zealand, rather than using NZ as a comparison
- provided recommendations that did not reflect equitable outcomes or that were very vague and unsupported – e.g. “fundraise”
- showed little understanding of key health concepts
- did not use valid referenced evidence and/or used minimal evidence which was not referenced.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

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

- provided in-depth supporting evidence from differing sources
- explained in-depth two major influences and link them in depth to either the political, economic or cultural determinants of health
- explained in depth two recommendations that both linked to the influencing factors previously discussed, and displayed an understanding of equitable outcomes
- outlined a health issue that is causing international concern from the list of prescribed issues
- used valid, referenced evidence
- explained in detail the influence of two determinants of health on the chosen issue and used some valid referenced evidence to illustrate their claims.

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 commonly:

- provided a wide range of valid supporting evidence from a wide range of credible sources
- demonstrated a perceptive analysis of the two major determinants of health and comprehensively explained how these are influencing the international health issue
- considered the big picture and could explain inter-relationships between determinants
- coherently explained two recommendations that are both linked to the influencing factors previously outlined, with details about how these recommendations can be actioned
- included valid supporting evidence in their recommendations, in order to support their proposal. They did this by showing links to parts of the Ottawa Charter or to strategies from the World Health Organisation, the United Nations, or to other previous successful health campaigns
- outlined a health issue that is causing international concern from the list of prescribed issues and clearly outlined the impacts on wellbeing through use of valid referenced evidence
- provided a perceptive and coherent analysis of the influence of two determinants of health on their chosen issue
- explained two strategies that addressed both of the chosen determinants of health, where the explanation was coherent, linked to underlying health concepts and made consistent use of valid referenced evidence
- provided perceptive analysis of how outcomes could be made more equitable.

OTHER COMMENTS

Some candidates still appear to be writing what would appear to be memorised answers. They appear not to be reading the questions or not tailoring their answers to the questions posed. Candidates are strongly discouraged from regurgitating memorised information that bears little relation to the question asked. This approach is likely to mean that candidates do not achieve the results they might have been capable of had they considered their answer.

Excessive use of additional paper and much additional writing does not necessarily correlate with reaching a higher grade, and in some cases in 2013 the excessive length of the response affectively weakened the response. In general, the amount of writing space provided in the examination booklet should be sufficient for most candidates to do justice to the questions in the paper. Candidates who use outdated evidence (e.g. material published more than five years ago) or who cite evidence that is not credible as research (e.g. class notes), will be disadvantaged.

Candidates are advised not to repeat information they have already provided in earlier sections of the paper. Some candidates used incorrect terminology (e.g. 'catching/caught' AIDS), implying a poor understanding of the health issue.

91465 Evaluate models for health promotion

ACHIEVEMENT

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

- demonstrated some understanding of the difference between the collective action, behaviour change and self-empowerment models health promotion
- provided some explanation of how each model was represented in the CNC campaign
- explained some advantages and disadvantages of using these models in the CNC campaign
- correctly linked principles of at least two supporting documents (Ottawa Charter, Bangkok Charter, Treaty of Waitangi) to the CNC campaign
- provided some possible implications for the well-being of individuals and communities
- drew some valid conclusions about the effectiveness of the models used in the CNC campaign.

NOT ACHIEVED

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

- quoted extensively from the resource, but did not interpret, explain or evaluate how the quoted material was reflected in the campaign
- did not explain the advantages and disadvantages of the models of health promotion (collective action, behaviour change, self-empowerment)
- did not identify specific implications for the well-being of individuals and communities
did not attempt all parts of the paper.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

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

- provided clear links between the CNC campaign and the three models of health promotion
- demonstrated how the resource material was reflected in the CNC campaign by explaining and rephrasing rather than using lengthy quotes
- explained the advantages and disadvantages of the use of the three models of health promotion in the CNC campaign
- demonstrated some understanding of the effectiveness of the use of the models for improving well-being of individuals and communities.

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 commonly:

- demonstrated a clear conceptual understanding of the CNC campaign and its links to the three models of health promotion, the Charters and the Treaty of Waitangi
- recognised that the collective action model of health promotion is not an “add on” to the behaviour change or self-empowerment models
- demonstrated understanding of the relationship between the effectiveness of the campaign and the underlying concepts
- demonstrated insight and critical thinking when considering the implications for well-being
- clearly understood how the models of health promotion related to the underlying concepts.

OTHER COMMENTS

The *behaviour change* model was not clearly understood by a significant number of the candidates, many of whom merely quoted “targeted strategies to change behaviours” and then provided incorrect or no explanation of which “strategies” or aspects of the campaign were behaviour change.

Many students appeared to view the collective action model as an “add on” to the behaviour change and/or self-empowerment models rather than seeing behaviour change as a model in its own right – i.e. an independent model of health promotion.

Many students used the resource material to good effect.

Showing understanding of the implications for well-being was the weakest area for all candidates. A significant number of candidates provided none, or minimal, comment on the effectiveness of the use of the models in improving well-being for individuals and communities.

The Treaty of Waitangi was not well understood by many candidates. The articles of the treaty were often incorrectly linked to the campaign, e.g. “the crown has to stop New Zealanders from gambling”.