



National Certificate of Educational Achievement
TAUMATA MĀTAURANGA Ā-MOTU KUA TAEA

Exemplar for Internal Achievement Standard English Level 2

This exemplar supports assessment against:

Achievement Standard 91105

Use information literacy skills to form developed conclusion(s)

An annotated exemplar is an extract of student evidence, with a commentary, to explain key aspects of the standard. It assists teachers to make assessment judgements at the grade boundaries.

New Zealand Qualifications Authority

To support internal assessment

	Grade Boundary: Low Excellence
1.	<p>For Excellence, the student needs to use information literacy skills to form developed conclusion(s) perceptively.</p> <p>The steps taken will include completing a systematic exploration into a valid area of inquiry by framing the inquiry, locating and processing information, and evaluating the information selected.</p> <p>The perceptive use of information literacy skills involves developing insightful/original conclusions, connected to the inquiry and based on the information gathered.</p> <p>This student has framed and conducted an inquiry into the effectiveness of rehabilitation of prisoners (1). Appropriate strategies to locate and process information have been used, such as locating a wide and relevant range of sources, note-taking, data chart and recording of source details (2). The student has evaluated the reliability and usefulness of these sources (3).</p> <p>Building on the information gathered, the student forms generally perceptive conclusions that show some insight (4). These conclusions are connected to the purpose and direction of investigation, and address the hypothesis and questions posed. The information (given as a summary, with paraphrases and quotations from clearly cited sources) underpins the student's own opinions, judgements and suggested solution.</p> <p>For a more secure Excellence, the student could use the information gathered from the <i>Senseless Sentencing</i> article (5) to build on their conclusions about prisoner rehabilitation in a way that demonstrates further insight.</p>

Framing the Inquiry

See written report

Locating and processing information (2)

Source	Key Q. 1: What is rehabilitation? What does it involve?	Key Q. 2: How effective is it vs negative aspects, eg. cost. And what are alternatives to rehabilitation?
Gordon, Claire. <i>Prisons neither deter crime nor rehabilitate criminals</i> . 2010. Student at Yale Opposing Viewpoints in Contexts: galegroup.com. http://bit.ly/TOcd60		America imprisons more of its citizens than any other country in the world – 1% of population. Underclass – 1 in 36 hispanics, 1 in 3 blacks imprisoned. It costs \$23,876 to imprison someone for a year. Because inmates are exploited of cheap labour this perpetuates violence rather than rehabilitates them, inmates are also kept in solitary confinement with little human interaction – mental degeneration. Once convicted of felony, stripped of rights > cannot vote. Restricted employment. Not enough programmes offered. Drug treatment is only available to 1 in 10 inmates who need it.
Vaeroy, H., Andreson, K., Mowinkel, P. <i>The Likelihood of Successful Crime Prevention: Norwegian Detainees on Preventive Detention Views on Programmes and services Organized and Provided by the Criminal Justice System</i> . Psychiatry, Psychology and Law, Vol 18:2, p.240-247. 2011.		73% detainees acknowledge their risk of reoffending because of vulnerability. 58% thought rehabilitation programmes negative and not available enough. 69% did not think it was effective and had bad experiences with rehabilitation. Need to be more individually based approach.
Newbold, Greg (former prisoner, now expert on crime and punishment). <i>The Problem of Reoffending</i> . The Press, Christchurch. March 24, 2007.	-tried different ways to rehabilitate criminals 'Tough love', beating and disciplining, bread and water diets, locked up longer 'soft love', extra privileges, counselling, special courses, released early. Doesn't make a difference, the recidivist rate is the same (70%).	'Reason prison inmates should be doing programmes is because they don't want to go back. A lot of prisoners don't actually care much. A lot of criminals like the way they are so they'll do the programmes to impress the parole board but it's actually a wasted investment because they don't have any intention of going straight.'
Lomas, D. <i>Senseless Sentencing</i> . NZ Listener, July 30, 2011.		Rehabilitation system does not offer many drug treatment programmes by 83% of prisoners have drug/alcohol problems which they don't fix so are likely to get another sentence. ½ come back within a year. Only about 5% of all offenders are required to do a substance abuse programme. Drug and alcohol units are responsible for 30% reduction in recidivism for those who complete programme. Corrections Department only spends 3.4m on 1.1b budget. Problems with overcrowding undo good of rehab. "Break the cycle" instead of putting minor offenders in prison put them in community based rehab programmes.

...Sources 5 & 6 not included in this exemplar...

Evaluating the reliability and usefulness of selected information (3)

Source	Information found	Usefulness of information
Prisons neither deter crime nor rehabilitate criminals	Q2. Cost, # people imprisoned, racial bias, inmates exploited, makes situation worse.	Could be biased because only trying to show negatives to back up statement. However is interesting and is reinforced by other research so is useful.
...the likelihood of successful crime prevention...	Q2. What prisoners think of rehab programmes	Limited to study in Norway. > think about relevance to rest of world. Can be used as a specific example.
The problem of reoffending	Q1. Ways government has tried to rehabilitate inmates. Q2. Prisoners don't really care, wasted investment > attitude.	Relevant to NZ. Both questions. I think source can be trusted: newspaper; experienced criminologist.

... sources 4, 5 & 6 not included in this exemplar...

Form developed conclusions

Recently I watched 'Shawshank Redemption,' which raises the issue of rehabilitation and its effect on the prisoners, and this made me think about the effectiveness of rehabilitation. To find out more about how this applies to the real world, I decided to do my research report on this. My hypothesis was 'It is worth investing time and money into rehabilitation programmes for criminals.' (1)

I broke this down into two key questions; primarily, 'What is rehabilitation and what does it actually involve?' and secondly, 'How effective are the current rehabilitation programmes vs. the negative aspects (such as cost) of these programmes, and how could these be improved?' (1)

So, what is rehabilitation and what does it involve?

Greg Newbold, a former prisoner and now expert on crime and punishment, explained some of the New Zealand government's attempts at rehabilitating prisoners in the Press article 'The Problem of Reoffending.' *I think that this is a reliable source because of Greg Newbold's experience in the matter and I find newspapers to have little bias. Also, this article is relevant to New Zealand so I find it easier to understand some of the ideals.* One of the ways rehabilitation was attempted was through 'Tough Love,' where prisoners were heavily disciplined, and were put on bread and water diets, locked up for longer times and beaten to punish and deter prisoners. However this was reasonably ineffective, so another approach, 'Soft Love,' was applied. In this, prisoners were offered extra privileges, counselling, education programmes, special courses, and were released early for good behaviour. This is commonly what we think of when we think of rehabilitation. However, both approaches made little difference to the crime and recidivism rate for prisoners — it remained approximately 70%. *This made me think about how effective these forms of rehab actually are. I think that through 'Tough Love' this would make inmates angry towards the state and although deter them from crime, angry prisoners are not someone you would want as your next-door-neighbour. Alternatively, it could institutionalise prisoners like in 'Shawshank Redemption'.* (4)

According to a report from 'World and I' titled 'Rehabilitating Rehabilitation,'² rehabilitation is a way to justify the imprisonment of an offender, as it is necessary to reform inmates. *I had not thought about this approach, as my idea on why we lock people up is to protect society, rather than the prisoners.* (4) The objectives of a rehabilitation programme are to change the character of the prisoner to conform to the law, and to return a productive citizen to society. The report suggested the best way for this to be carried out was through making the programmes 'offender oriented', to target and solve each individual case, rather than using a 'blanket programme. *This makes sense to me as it reminds me of the variance in character in 'Shawshank Redemption,' I think if a programme was attempted to rehabilitate these prisoners, trying to force them all into the same programme would not work because each character would not relate well to the same thing.* (4) Rehabilitation also involves Family Counselling (especially for youth) and in New Zealand, has a strong focus on personal responsibility.

How effective is Rehabilitation and what are improvements that could be made to the system?

America imprisons nearly 1% of their population - more of its citizens than any other county in the world, but this is closely followed by New Zealand. *This is a lot more than we should expect in prison. So does this mean that our rehabilitation programmes aren't working?* (4) According to a study published in 'Psychiatry, Psychology and Law,' *Norwegian detainees do not think so.* (4) The study revealed that 73% of the offenders interviewed acknowledged their risk of reoffending because they felt vulnerable and felt they would not be set up to leave their life of crime when released from prison. One of the reasons for this was because they are a lot less likely to be employed and felt the only way to get money may be through illegal means. 58% of prisoners also felt negative towards rehabilitation programmes or felt they were not available enough, and 69% found rehabilitation unhelpful or ineffective and had bad experiences with the rehabilitation courses offered. The study suggested a more individually based approach would be a lot more beneficial to the inmates, and more accepting attitudes from the general public can also play a large role in the success of rehabilitation.

'Rehabilitating Rehabilitation' also agreed that rehabilitation fails because the programmes are based on character building, which is undermined because prisons are degrading. The public expects longer sentences for the prisoners, as punishment of the crime, but this renders the objective of rehabilitation ineffective. Not to mention, the longer an inmate spends in prison, the more expensive it is for taxpayers. *So perhaps the attitude towards rehabilitation is wrong: for it to be effective people have to be more accepting towards criminals. But this isn't easy, especially for the victims of crime.* (4) The article also named alternatives, which seem closer to the systems in place today: Incapitation, which is deterrence through incarceration, punishment, which involves capital punishment and is fashioned to deter crime as well, and retribution, which involves making the prisoners take responsibility for their actions; perhaps through money or labour. *However, although these seem plausible, they don't seem to work in conjunction with rehabilitation programmes. This makes me consider again how much the prison system needs remodelling to allow for a productive citizen to be released back into society with little risk of reoffending.* (4) Greg Newbold believes that the attitudes of prisoners also have to change for them to be rehabilitated. He says 'The reason prison inmates should be doing programmes is because they don't want to go back. A lot of prisoners don't actually care much. A lot of criminals like the way that they are so they'll do the programmes to impress the parole board but it's actually a wasted investment because they don't have any intention of going straight.' *I think this is a particularly valid point because without the drive of the prisoners to turn their life around, it won't happen.* (4)

It also may be the type of rehabilitation courses offered that is unsuccessful for keeping our citizens out of prison. (4) *In the Listener article 'Senseless Sentencing' based off ideas in 'Flying Blind' by Roger Brooking, Roger Brooking states* (5) that there is a large gap in the programmes offered by prisons to stop inmates reoffending; the Rehabilitation system does not offer many drug treatment programmes, ...*(paragraph continues)*....

In conclusion, my findings show that currently the rehabilitation programmes offered, if any, are insufficient because they are not modelled correctly for the needs of prisoners. I still believe that rehabilitation programmes are an important investment and agree with the objective of producing a productive citizen who can safely join the workforce. But first focusses and attitudes have to change to allow this to work. It is important to get governments investing in the right programmes. Based on my research, gearing programmes to a more individually based approach is also an aspect that should be considered, so the programmes can be more effective and stimulating to the needs of the prisoners. (4)

References

'The Problem Of Reoffending,' by Greg Newbold. The Press, March 24, 2007. Greg Newbold was a former prisoner and now expert criminologist.
'Rehabilitating Rehabilitation,' from 'The World and I,' ISSN 08879346 By Ralph A / Rossum and Contance Rossum. (<http://bit.ly/PwuvvN>)
'Prison; too Harsh or not Hard Enough?' by Marc Alexander, The Press March 22, 2006.
'The Likelihood of Successful Crime Prevention : Norwegian Detainees on Preventative Detention Views on Programmes and Services Organised and Provided by the Criminal Justice System,' study in Norway conducted by Henning Varøy, Klaus Andreson and Petter Mowinkel. Published in 'Psychiatry, Psychology and Law.' ISSN: 13218719 (<http://bit.ly/QxpFvci>)
5 Roger Brooking is the writer for the Drug and Alcoholic Assessments for the NZ Parole Board who wrote 'Flying Blind,' a book about the problems with the NZ Rehabilitation System.

	Grade Boundary: High Merit
2.	<p>For Merit, the student needs to use information literacy skills to form developed conclusion(s) convincingly.</p> <p>The steps taken will include completing a systematic exploration into a valid area of inquiry by framing the inquiry, locating and processing information, and evaluating the information selected.</p> <p>The convincing use of information literacy skills involves developing reasoned and clear conclusions, connected to the inquiry and based on the information gathered.</p> <p>This student has framed and conducted an inquiry into the current use of animal testing by establishing a hypothesis and posing questions (1). Appropriate strategies to locate and process information have been used, such as locating a wide and relevant range of sources, note-taking, data chart and recording of source details (2). The student has evaluated the reliability and usefulness of these sources (3).</p> <p>The student has formed clear and reasoned conclusions (4) that are created and built from the gathered information. These conclusions are connected to the purpose and direction of investigation, and they address the hypothesis and questions posed. The judgements about ethical issues are becoming insightful. The information (given as summary, paraphrase and quotation from clearly cited sources) underpins the student's own opinions and judgements.</p> <p>To reach Excellence, the student could use the information gathered about the advantages and disadvantages of animal testing to build on the opinions and judgements expressed. Perceptive conclusions should demonstrate the students own insight/originality about the subject of inquiry.</p>

Student 2

Framing the Inquiry

See written report

Locating and processing information (2)

Source: Record source details. Title, author, date, publisher, URL	Source 1: Animal Experimentation, 2007. Alix Favo, Greenhaven Press, 2004. http://ic.galegroup.com 'Chemical testing on animals is unreliable'	Source 2: www.understandinganimalresearch.org.uk/	Source 3: http://ic.galegroup.com Author: People for the ethical treatment of animals (PETA), title: Product testing on animals is cruel and unnecessary.
Question 1: Why do we test on animals?	85,000+ chemicals on the market: dyes, insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, rodenticides, soaps and detergents, synthetic fibres and rubbers, glues and solvents, paper and textile chemicals, plastics and resins, food additives and preservatives, refrigerants, explosives, chemical warfare agents, cleaning and polishing materials, and cosmetics – and 1,500 – 2,000 new chemicals are added to that toxic flow each year.	"Nearly every Nobel Laureate in Physiology or Medicine since 1901 has relied on animal data for their research." Breakdown of what is tested on animals. Only 2 percent of testing in UK is for safety testing of things like cleaners etc (not research for medical advances).	A range of household products including cosmetics and cleaners are routinely tested on animals

...sources 4, 5 & 6 not included in this exemplar...

Evaluating the reliability and usefulness of selected information (3)

Source	Information found	How reliable is the source?
1: Animal Experimentation, 2007. Alix Favo, Greenhaven Press, 2004. http://ic.galegroup.com 'Chemical testing on animals is unreliable'	Testing on animals is unlikely to help humans because we are so different, and animals can have different reactions. Animals are kept in poor condition and go through stressful test and some end with diseases and even killed.	Reliable – presents a lot of information on different test and studies on animals and explains them clearly. It's from a press and taken from the EPIC data base. The author Alix Fano is director of the campaign for responsible transplantation and the author of Lethal Laws: Animal Testing, Human health and Environmental policy.
2: <i>Forty reasons why we need animals in research</i> - school resource from: www.understandinganimalresearch.org.uk/	There is a big range of testing but most of it in the UK is not for 'safety testing'. Lots of points about the importance of animal research in medical breakthroughs.	Reliable factually as it is made up of lots of groups. But they are medical and science interest groups so generally will be supporting their industry.

... sources 3 – 6 not included in this exemplar....

Forms developed conclusions

I decided to study animal testing after studying the film Never Let me Go, and thinking about the ethical issues it raises about scientific progress. I also read an interesting article 'Animal Experimentation Is Unscientific' by Javier Burgos, who is the president of the Nature of wellness which is an organization devoted to informing the public about the medical and scientific invalidity of animal experimentation and testing. This article describes with detail the different painful and cruel tests that animals go through and how they're treated as if they were lifeless objects, it's even a nightmare to imagine it. I chose this topic because I was surprised by the cruel things that animals have to go through and how people decide to ignore these things, just like in the film, where humans mostly ignored what was happening with the clones. My hypothesis is: That current animal testing is unnecessary and therefore unethical. My key questions are: Why do we test on animals? What are the advantages / disadvantages of animal testing? (1)

According to the BBC Knowledge tv series, *Pain, Pus and Poison*, there have been huge changes in medicine over the last 150 years. This is because of experimentation. A huge killer of people was smallpox. The documentary stated that the vaccination for this was trialled on an 8 year old boy by first infecting him with cowpox then rubbing an open wound with pus from a smallpox patient. As the presenter stated, this was so risky and unethical! But it worked and smallpox, the world's biggest killer of all time, was eliminated by the late twentieth century. Animal testing was shown in the search for a form of arsenic that could treat syphilis: this was done by injecting hundreds of rabbits. Over 600 rabbits would have died, but the one that lived with no ill-effects led directly to a treatment that saved people from a devastating disease. The series showed me just how much people's attitudes to the idea of ethics and rights have changed over time. (4) This source was informative and gave me a historical perspective that I didn't find in my other sources. It was interesting that it commented on the ethics of human testing only. (3)

What is animal testing like today? There are a wide range of products tested on animals. According to the article found on ic.galegroup.com 'Chemical testing on animals is unreliable' more than 85,000 products that are on the market are tested on animals,... (*information given*). Animals are also used in vaccine, drug and military tests which means they have to get lots of the most dangerous viruses or go through radiation, weapon and explosives testing (*information given*). I was surprised at the huge range of products that were tested and just how many weren't related to medical progress. But this is different from information on the Understanding Animal Research which states that 2% of animal research is for safety testing. This is testing of "chemicals which are in everyday use - such as medicines or household products - as well as chemicals used in manufacturing, or fertilisers and pesticides used in farming". This site is a UK one and The Council of Understanding Medical Research is supported by lots of "various sectors including academic, pharmaceutical, charities, research funders, professional and learned societies". I don't know if the 2% includes things like military tests. It is hard to find out the extent and range of animal testing as there are lots of numbers used to support different groups' arguments. (3) The Humane Society International website states, "It is estimated that more than 115 million animals worldwide are used in laboratory experiments every year. But because only a small proportion of countries collect and publish data concerning animal use for testing and research, the precise number is unknown." This number, in the hundreds of millions every year, is far different from the 600 rabbits it took to find a cure for syphilis. But the world no longer has such devastating diseases so it seems hard to understand why we need to kill so many more animals. (4) Different countries have different rules. Eg. In UK there is no testing of cosmetics/toiletries ingredients after 1998 (www.Understandinganimalresearch.org.uk). But it makes me question why they ever were, as cosmetics and weapons are not medical cures. (4)

"Animal testing is essential to drug and vaccine research. In particular animal experiments have been vital in discovering drugs that slow the progress of the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) the virus that causes AIDS. Similar advancements have occurred in developing treatments for herpes and hepatitis B, all of this because of animal testing," says professor of laboratory medicine Rebecca Corey, the author of the article 'Animal testing is essential for medical research'. According to another article found on ic.galegroup.com 'Chemical testing on animals saves lives,' "testing chemicals on animals helps protect human health. For example, studies have indicated that frogs and rats suffer adverse effects from pesticides such as atrazine, diazinon and dursban. Animal test results led to the banning of these products by the environmental agency." Animal testing can help humans in developing new vaccines or drugs against the most dangerous viruses such as AIDS, but I still think that there is a problem because animals have to suffer and die due to testing. (4)

Sometimes animal testing seems to be the only way of finding out a solution to a medical problem. If it's something as widespread and deadly as smallpox or AIDS then there is a justification for it. (4) A One News report (25/10/14) on Ebola showed an Australian laboratory that was doing research. There weren't any animals in the news footage. When such deadly new viruses happen then the emphasis is on getting rid of it as fast as possible. According to 'Did Scientists Just discover a cure for Ebola' on 'The Disease Daily' website, "Researchers from the National Microbiology Laboratory in Winnipeg, Manitoba identified a number of antibodies that corresponded to proteins on the shell of the Ebola virus. They combined the antibodies into a specific cocktail and administered it to four macaques within 24 hours of infection. All four macaques survived. When the cocktail was administered within 48 hours of infection, two of four macaques survived." The disease is spread by contact with infected animals. In the case of Ebola, I can't find any sources that say that the harm to monkeys is worse than finding a cure. This could be because like other really serious diseases like the examples in the BBC series, at times of crisis people will want a cure, and the ethics don't matter so much. (4) But also the images of the lab without animals made think also about the changes in medical research over time. (4) The BBC series explained that today there is more research done at the microbe level, and using dna testing, rather than animals.

There are other disadvantages to using animals for testing. According to the article found in ic.galegroup.com 'Chemical testing on animals is unreliable' mice are regularly used in chemical testing and their physiology, which is very different from humans, makes them inadequate and unreliable subjects. In a programme 'Endocrine Disruptor screening programme' 60,000 chemicals were tested on nearly half a million animals to determine whether and how chemicals disrupt the human hormonal system, despite crucial differences in humans' and animals' endocrine systems. In Burgos' article he states that "since every species is unique, it is absurd to believe that human diseases can be cured by applying information garnered from animal experimentation." Both of these authors are commenting on medical research, and the huge numbers of animals involved seems excessive. On the other hand, I think it's unrealistic to expect all medical research to produce successful results on the first experiment. In my opinion, it depends on the purpose of the research. Having seen horrific images of children who had syphilis on the BBC documentary, I think that the use of several hundred rabbits was worth it to find a cure. (4) I also find Burgos' statement to be wrong as it contradicts what has been found out about ebola (3), which 'The Disease Daily' states began in other species.

According to Ingrid Newkirk, Co-founder and president of the organization 'People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals' millions of animals suffer through stressful and unnecessary tests every year. Animals are kept in bad conditions and killed in painful and cruel ways during testing ... So if all of this is true why are we allowing it to happen? It links to the information gathered above. Sometimes there are clear links between animal testing and cures (like smallpox, syphilis and ebola) but sometimes there aren't. There needs to be clear regulations across the testing industry so that animals are harmed only where there is no other way of finding out. (4) The Humane Society International also states this: "Modern non-animal techniques are already reducing and superseding experiments on animals, and in European Union, the "3Rs" principle of replacement, reduction and refinement of animal experiments is a legal requirement." But it says it is not a requirement in other countries. It comes down to how we measure up the value of lives, human vs animal, and what it is that is being tested, and what testing tools are available at that time. (4)

So overall I believe my hypothesis was mostly right. In the past it was really important to do testing on animals and people. But times have changed. I don't think animal testing is going to disappear but we must only do tests that are really necessary, like doing vaccine research in case a new threatening virus appears and only if there is no other way. (4)

	Grade Boundary: Low Merit
3.	<p>For Merit, the student needs to use information literacy skills to form developed conclusion(s) convincingly.</p> <p>The steps taken will include completing a systematic exploration into a valid area of inquiry by framing the inquiry, locating and processing information, and evaluating the information selected.</p> <p>The convincing use of information literacy skills involves developing reasoned and clear conclusions, connected to the inquiry and based on the information gathered.</p> <p>This student has framed and conducted an inquiry into the ethics of animal testing by establishing a hypothesis and posing questions (1). Appropriate strategies to locate and process information have been used, such as locating a wide and relevant range of sources, note-taking, data chart and recording of source details (2). The student has evaluated the reliability and usefulness of these sources (3).</p> <p>The student forms generally clear and reasoned conclusions (4) that are created and built from the gathered information. These conclusions are connected to the purpose and direction of investigation and mostly address the hypothesis and questions posed. This information (given as summary, paraphrase and quotation from cited sources) underpins the student's own opinions and judgements.</p> <p>For a more secure Merit, the student could make their conclusions more convincing by using the information gathered about the purposes and types of animal testing to build on the opinions and judgements expressed about the reasons for animal testing.</p>

Locating and processing information (2)

Source: Record source details. Title, author, date, publisher, URL	Source 1: Animal Experimentation, 2007. Alix Favo, Greenhaven Press, 2004. http://ic.galegroup.com 'Chemical testing on animals is unreliable'	Source 2: www.understandinganimalresearch.org.uk/	Source 3: http://ic.galegroup.com Author: People for the ethical treatment of animals (PETA), title: Product testing on animals is cruel and unnecessary.
Question 1: Why do we test on animals?	85,000+ chemicals on the market: dyes, insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, rodenticides, soaps and detergents, synthetic fibres and rubbers, glues and solvents, paper and textile chemicals, plastics and resins, food additives and preservatives, refrigerants, explosives, chemical warfare agents, cleaning and polishing materials, and cosmetics – and 1,500 – 2,000 new chemicals are added to that toxic flow each year.	“Nearly every Nobel Laureate in Physiology or Medicine since 1901 has relied on animal data for their research.” Breakdown of what is tested on animals. Only 2 percent of testing in UK is for safety testing of things like cleaners etc (not research for medical advances).	A range of household products including cosmetics and cleaners are routinely tested on animals

...sources 4, 5 & 6 not included in this exemplar...

Evaluating the reliability and usefulness of selected information (3)

Source	Information found	How reliable is the source?
1: Animal Experimentation, 2007. Alix Favo, Greenhaven Press, 2004. http://ic.galegroup.com 'Chemical testing on animals is unreliable'	Testing on animals is unlikely to help humans because we are so different, and animals can have different reactions. Animals are kept in poor condition and go through stressful test and some end with diseases and even killed.	Reliable – presents a lot of information on different test and studies on animals and explains them clearly. It's from a press and taken from the EPIC data base. The author Alix Fano is director of the campaign for responsible transplantation and the author of Lethal Laws: Animal Testing, Human health and Environmental policy.
2: <i>Forty reasons why we need animals in research</i> - school resource from: www.understandinganimalresearch.org.uk/	There is a big range of testing but most of it in the UK is not for 'safety testing'. Lots of points about the importance of animal research in medical breakthroughs.	Reliable factually as it is made up of lots of groups. But they are medical and science interest groups so generally will be supporting their industry.

... sources 3 – 6 not included in this exemplar...

Forms developed conclusions

I decided to study animal testing after studying the film Never Let me Go, and thinking about the ethical issues it raises about scientific progress. I also read an interesting article 'Animal Experimentation Is Unscientific' by Javier Burgos, who is the president of the Nature of wellness which is an organization devoted to informing the public about the medical and scientific invalidity of animal experimentation and testing. This article describes with detail the different painful and cruel tests that animals go through and how they're treated as if they were lifeless objects, it's even a nightmare to imagine it. I chose this topic because I was surprised by the cruel things that animals have to go through and how people decide to ignore these things, just like in the film, where humans mostly ignored what was happening with the clones. My hypothesis is: **That all current animal testing is unethical. . My key questions are: Why do we test on animals? What are the advantages / disadvantages of animal testing?** (1)

There are a wide range of products tested on animals. According to the article found on ic.galegroup.com 'Chemical testing on animals is unreliable' more than 85,000 products that are on the market are tested on animals,...(information given). Animals are also used in vaccine, drug and military tests which means they have to get lots of the most dangerous viruses or go through radiation, weapon and explosives testing (information given). After reading these two sources I was surprised at the huge range of products that were tested and just how many weren't related to medical progress. But this is different from information on the Understanding Animal Research which states that 2% of animal research is for safety testing. This is testing of " chemicals which are in everyday use - such as medicines or household products - as well as chemicals used in manufacturing, or fertilisers and pesticides used in farming". **This site is a UK one and The Council of Understanding Medical Research is supported by lots of "various sectors including academic, pharmaceutical, charities, research funders, professional and learned societies".** I don't

know if the 2% includes things like military tests. It is hard to find out the extent and range of animal testing as there are lots of numbers used to support different groups' arguments. Different countries also might have different rules. (3) Eg. In UK there is no testing of cosmetics/toiletries ingredients after 1998 (www. Understandinganimalresearch.org.uk).

"Animal testing is essential to drug and vaccine research. In particular animal experiments have been vital in discovering drugs that slow the progress of the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) the virus that causes AIDS. Similar advancements have occurred in developing treatments for herpes and hepatitis B, all of this because of animal testing," says professor of laboratory medicine Rebecca Corey, the author of the article 'Animal testing is essential for medical research'. According to another article found on ic.galegroup.com 'Chemical testing on animals saves lives,' "testing chemicals on animals helps protect human health. For example, studies have indicated that frogs and rats suffer adverse effects from pesticides such as atrazine, diazinon and dursban. Animal test results led to the banning of these products by the environmental agency." This article made me think differently about my hypothesis, now I can see that animal testing can help humans in developing new vaccines or drugs against the most dangerous viruses such as AIDS, **but I still think that there is a problem because animals have to suffer and die due to testing.**(4)

According to the BBC Knowledge tv series, *Pain, Pus and Poison*, there have been huge changes in medicine over the last 150 years. This is because of experimentation. A huge killer of people was smallpox. The documentary stated that the vaccination for this was trialled on an 8 year old boy by first infecting him with cowpox then rubbing an open wound with pus from a smallpox patient. As the presenter stated, this was so risky and unethical! But it worked and smallpox, the world's biggest killer of all time, was eliminated by the late twentieth century. Animal testing was shown in the search for a form of arsenic that could treat syphilis: this was done by injecting hundreds of rabbits. Over 600 rabbits would have died, but the one that lived with no ill-effects led directly to a treatment that saved people from a devastating disease. The series showed me just **how much people's attitudes to the idea of ethics and rights have changed over time.** (4) This source was informative and gave me a historical perspective that I didn't find in my other sources. It was interesting that it commented on the ethics of human testing only. (3) Sometimes animal testing seems to be the only way of finding out a solution to a medical problem. If it's something as widespread and deadly as smallpox or AIDS then there is a justification for it. (4) A One News report (25/10/14) on Ebola showed an Australian laboratory that was doing research. There weren't any animals in the news footage. When such deadly new viruses happen then the emphasis is on getting rid of it as fast as possible. According to 'Did Scientists Just discover a cure for Ebola' on 'The Disease Daily' website, "Researchers from the National Microbiology Laboratory in Winnipeg, Manitoba identified a number of antibodies that corresponded to proteins on the shell of the Ebola virus. They combined the antibodies into a specific cocktail and administered it to four macaques within 24 hours of infection. All four macaques survived. When the cocktail was administered within 48 hours of infection, two of four macaques survived." The disease is spread by contact with infected animals. In the case of Ebola, I can't find any sources that say that the harm to monkeys is worse than finding a cure. **This could be because like other really serious diseases like the examples in the BBC series, at times of crisis people will want a cure, and the ethics don't matter so much.** (4)

What are the bad things about animal testing? According to the article found in ic.galegroup.com 'Chemical testing on animals is unreliable' mice are regularly used in chemical testing and their physiology, which is very different from humans, makes them inadequate and unreliable subjects. In a programme 'Endocrine Disruptor screening programme' 60,000 chemicals were tested on tens of millions of animals to determine whether and how chemicals disrupt human hormonal system, despite crucial differences in humans' and animals' endocrine systems. In Burgos' article he states that "since every species is unique, it is absurd to believe that human diseases can be cured by applying information garnered from animal experimentation." Both of these authors are commenting on medical research, **and the huge numbers of animals involved seems excessive. On the other hand, I think it's unrealistic to expect all medical research to produce successful results on the first experiment. I think it depends on the purpose of the research. Having seen horrific images of children who had syphilis on the BBC documentary, I think that the use of several hundred rabbits was worth it to find a cure.** (4) I also find Burgos' statement to be wrong as it contradicts what has been found out about AIDS and ebola. (3)

According to Ingrid Newkirk, Co-founder and president of the organization 'People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals' millions of animals suffer through stressful and unnecessary tests every year. Animals are kept in bad conditions and killed in painful and cruel ways during testing ... **So if all of this is true why are we allowing it to happen? It links to the information gathered above. Sometimes there are clear links between animal testing and cures (like smallpox, syphilis and ebola) but sometimes there aren't. There needs to be clear regulations across the testing industry so that animals are harmed only where there is no other way of finding out.** (4) After all the research I've done I have learned that animal testing has a positive and a negative side, but after reading several articles I realized that it's a really huge issue.

In conclusion I believe my hypothesis was partly right. **However, I can see that not all current tests are bad** (4), some of them have a good cause and can actually help such as vaccine research tests. **I don't think animal testing is going to disappear but at least we must do something to improve it** (4) by keeping animals in better conditions, trying to make the tests less painful and only do tests that are really necessary, like doing vaccine research in case a new threatening virus appears. (4) Animals may not think like we do, but after all they're alive and can feel just like us.

	Grade Boundary: High Achieved
4.	<p>For Achieved, the student needs to use information literacy skills to form developed conclusion(s).</p> <p>The steps taken will include completing a systematic exploration into a valid area of inquiry by framing the inquiry, locating and processing information, and evaluating the information selected</p> <p>Students need to create and build conclusions connected to the inquiry and based on the information gathered.</p> <p>This student has framed and conducted an inquiry into the effects of reality television by establishing a hypothesis and posing questions (1). Appropriate strategies to locate and process information have been used, such as locating a wide and relevant range of sources, note-taking, data chart and recording of source details (2). The student has evaluated the reliability and usefulness of these sources (3).</p> <p>The student has formed developed conclusions (4) that are created and built from the gathered information. These conclusions are connected to the purpose and direction of investigation, and address the hypothesis and questions posed. The information (given as a summary, paraphrases and quotations from clearly cited sources) generally underpins the student's own opinions and judgements.</p> <p>To reach Merit, the student could make their work on reality television more convincing by developing and supporting the argument with information gathered, rather than basing it mostly on personal experience.</p>

Framing the inquiry

See written report

Locating and processing information and Evaluating the reliability and usefulness of selected information (sources 6 & 7 not included in this exemplar)

Sources (2)	Question 1: Does reality tv reflect real life? (2)	Question 2: Is reality TV harmful? (2)	Reliable/useful? Why/why not? (3)
<p>"how reality tv fakes it" by James Poniewozik. www.time.com Jan 29th 2006, Time magazine (printed)</p>	<p>James states that the producers of a show 'the Dating Experiment' asked a contestant who their favorite celeb was. She said she really loved Adam Sandler. In the editing room they spliced our Adam's name and replaced it with her saying another contestant's name. This is called using frankenbites.</p>	<p>"real people who have to carry their fake reputations into their real lives."</p>	<p>yes: part of the Time magazine group. Have a reputation for quality journalism.</p>
<p>"Trade secrets: Behind the scenes of reality television." Jobs.aol.com by Bill Burman. April, 2010. (printed)</p>	<p>"sometimes when you see a reality show participant talking straight into the cameras, interview sytle, they aren't even talking about anything remotely related to what's happening at that moment on the show."</p>		<p>Useful. It is through a news site so reliable.</p>
<p>"does reality TV distort how young viewers perceive life?" cq researcherblog.blogspot.co.nz by Marryann Haggerty. Aug, 2010. (Printed).</p>		<p>"and what the vast body or research indicates is that kids who are exposed to higher levels of violence tend to behave more violently." "Because kids are seeing people close to their own age behaving a certain way on these reality programs, they tend to accept that that's normative behavior."</p>	<p>Reliable and useful. It is research and published.</p>
<p>"The real effects of reality TV" www.usatoday.com by Micki Fahner. April, 2012. (printed)</p>		<p>Dr Peter Christenson said, "while the shows did seem to inspire healthier behavior in some viewers, there was a lot of emphasis placed on superficiality. Something, which over time, he said, may have an effect on viewers' body image and self esteem." Dr Brad Gorham said, "All tv shows, not just reality shows, help construct scenarios that demonstrate how some behaviors will be rewarded or punished."</p>	<p>Reliable and useful. news site. Gives expert opinion based on evidence.</p>
<p>"Combating the negative impacts of reality tv on girls sense of self" by Jamshid Ghazi Akar. May 2012.</p>		<p>"It communicates the idea to girls that you can have no true girlfriends because your only goal in life is to find a man, and therefore every other woman is a potential love rival and therefore you can have no true female friendships."</p> <p>"of girls surveyed, regular reality tv viewers differ dramatically from non-viewing peers in their expectations of peer relationships, their overall self-image, and their understanding of how the world works."</p>	<p>Useful. Strong bias, probably has lots of omitted info.</p>

Forming developed conclusions

In class we have been studying a range of texts that deal with the topic of deception and manipulation. For this paper we are researching reality shows and their effect on teens. I wanted to find out if reality TV shows a good depiction of real life and if they are harmful to viewers. The questions I chose to use were: Does reality television reflect real life? And is reality TV harmful? (1)

Does reality TV reflect real life? The article 'Trade secrets: behind the scenes of reality television' written by Bill Burman who is a freelance writer and has worked on numerous reality shows (3) states in an article for <http://jobs.aol.com>1 "sometimes when you see a reality show participant talk straight into the camera, interview style, they aren't even talking about anything remotely related to what's happening at that moment on the show" which is related to the article 'How reality TV fakes it' written by James Poniewozik for www.time.com2 which Poniewozik states the producers of a show 'The Dating Experiment' asked a contestant who their favourite celeb was. She said she really loved Adam Sandler. They asked her this because she disliked one of the contestants but that wasn't what they wanted to hear so in the editing room they spliced out her saying Adam Sandler and replaced it with her saying the contestant's name. These articles back up my hypothesis that reality television doesn't show a true depiction of reality. Further evidence of this comes from the article 'How reality TV works' from the site <http://electronics.howstuffworks.com>3 which states that a reality shows segment producer or story editor usually assemble storyboards and shooting scripts, important tools for shaping the direction of the show. But if reality television only showed real life events, such crew wouldn't be necessary and there wouldn't be such a thing called 'frankenbites' (4) which is where they take a scene and change the sound to suit what they are trying to portray. One final blow to the reality television industry comes from the executive producer of the shows 'The Bachelor' and 'The Bachelorette' Mike Fleiss (3), who confirms that many reality shows are rigged. Fleiss then goes on to say "It's not completely fake but the best moments of those shows are usually orchestrated," which was published on www.edmontonjournal.com4 by Bill Graveland.

These articles all relate to my first question and back up my hypothesis that reality television doesn't depict real life. While watching these shows we should remember that they are made purely for entertainment and anything that is said or happens on the shows should be taken with a grain of salt because it may not reflect what has actually happened or be put out of context. But being put in the category of "reality" tv. can and does cause confusion for some because they believe that with the title of reality, they are seeing raw, firsthand footage of what actually happens in others' lives.(4)

Is reality television harmful? It could go both ways, because if you know that what you're watching isn't a real reflection of real life and that it's purely for entertainment then it's less likely to be harmful. (4) But some evidence suggesting that it may be harmful comes from the same article from www.time.com2. Poniewozik writes "The problem is that makers of reality TV have the power to imply or outright fabricate things about real people who have to carry their fake reputations into their real lives." This would suggest that it's harmful for the people who star in such shows, and for their family's too because they are possibly contractually obliged to pretend that who they are on the show is who they also are in real life. This could lead to contestants having personality or social type disorders. (4) The next article 'Does reality TV distort how young viewers perceive life?' written by Marryann Haggerty for <http://cgresearcherblog.blogspot.co.nz>5 states that "what the vast body of research indicates is that kids who are exposed to higher levels of violence tend to behave more violently" and "Kids who are exposed to higher levels of sex in the media tend to become sexually active earlier in life than peers with less exposure." Haggerty then says "Because kids are seeing people close to their own age behaving a certain way on these reality programs, they tend to accept that that's normative behaviour." Shows like 'Jersey Shore' and 'Jordy Shore' would be good examples of these types of behaviours. And I, myself see these types of behaviours and superficiality in my age group.(4) Another example of harm caused by such shows is written by Micki Fahner for www.usatodayeducation.com6 which states "It seems that reality show directors and producers are not looking to cast whole, complete people. They're casting types, and that leads to stereotyping" an example of this would be 'Jersey Shore' and their casting of "Guido" type people. The article then goes on to say "many reality programs demonstrate behaviour, but never show the characters facing the results of their actions." Jersey Shore can also be used for this example as they never show the reactions of their parents in relation to their drunken behaviour. Which is something that today's age see very little of. What we need to be doing is finding out what the youth are viewing the most (which from the articles I have read, points to mostly reality shows) and demonstrate that there will be consequences to negative actions and behaviours, if we are to have a more wholesome, morally and ethically accepted society. (4)

My last article written by Jamshid Ghazi Askar for the American news site www.deseretnews.com7 talks about the negative effects reality shows can have on females. Askar says "It [reality shows] communicates the idea to girls that you can have no true girlfriends because your only goal in life is to find a man, and therefore every other woman is a potential love rival and therefore you can have no true female friendships." He then goes on to saying 'of girls surveyed, regular reality TV viewers differ dramatically from non-viewing peers in their expectations of peer relationships, their overall self-image and their understanding of how the world works.' Which I can relate to as I prefer my boyfriend to have male friends than female due to the possible threat a female friend could cause. (4)

So to summarise, there is potential for reality television to cause harm. But if we teach our youth that all is not what it may seem on reality shows and that they are purely made for entertainment, we may start to have a media savvy generation who realise that the actions and behaviours demonstrated on such shows shouldn't be accepted or mirrored in real life. (4)

References

<http://jobs.aol.com/articles/2010/04/30/reality-television-secrets/>
<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1154194,00.html>
<http://electronics.howstuffworks.com/reality-tv4.htm>
<http://www.edmontonjournal.com/entertainment/all/Most+reality+fake+says+executive+producer+Bachelor.6777686/story.html>
<http://cgresearcherblog.blogspot.co.nz/2010/09/does-reality-tv-distort-how-young.html>
<http://www.usatodayeducation.com/staging/index.php/campuslife/the-real-effects-of-reality-tv>
<http://www.deseretnews.com/article/765578586/Combating-the-negative-impacts-of-reality-TV-on-girls-sense-of-self.html?pg=all>

	Grade Boundary: Low Achieved
5.	<p>For Achieved, the student needs to use information literacy skills to form developed conclusion(s).</p> <p>The steps taken will include completing a systematic exploration into a valid area of inquiry by framing the inquiry, locating and processing information, and evaluating the information selected</p> <p>Students need to create and build conclusions connected to the inquiry and based on the information gathered.</p> <p>This student has framed and conducted an inquiry into the ethics of animal testing by establishing a hypothesis and posing questions (1). Appropriate strategies to locate and process information have been used, such as locating a range of sources that is mostly relevant, note-taking, the use of a data chart, and the recording of source details (2). The student has evaluated the reliability and usefulness of these sources (3).</p> <p>The student has formed developed conclusions (4) that are usually created and built from the gathered information. The conclusions are generally connected to the purpose and direction of investigation, and address the hypothesis and questions posed. This information (given as summary, paraphrase and quotations from acknowledged sources) generally underpins the student's own opinions and judgements.</p> <p>For a more secure Achieved, the student could build and develop the judgements made about animal testing. Some sources are summarised and/or quoted from, but there is little use of them in the development of the student's own conclusions.</p>

Locating and processing information (2)

Source: Record source details. Title, author, date, publisher, URL	Source 1: Animal Experimentation, 2007. Alix Favo, Greenhaven Press, 2004. http://ic.galegroup.com 'Chemical testing on animals is unreliable'	Source 2: http://ic.galegroup.com 'opposing viewpoints in context' title: Animal testing is vital for medical research. Animal Experimentation, 2009. Ed. RD Lankford Jr. Greenhaven Press.	Source 3: http://ic.galegroup.com Author: People for the ethical treatment of animals (PETA), title: Product testing on animals is cruel and unnecessary.
Question 1: What type of products are tested on animals?	85,000+ chemicals on the market: dyes, insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, rodenticides, soaps and detergents, synthetic fibres and rubbers, glues and solvents, paper and textile chemicals, plastics and resins, food additives and preservatives, refrigerants, explosives, chemical warfare agents, cleaning and polishing materials, and cosmetics – and 1,500 – 2,000 new chemicals are added to that toxic flow each year.	Drugs – vaccines, viruses, toxicity tests.	A range of household products including cosmetics and cleaners are routinely tested on animals

...sources 4, 5 & 6 not included in this exemplar...

Evaluating the reliability and usefulness of selected information (3)

Source	Information found	How reliable is the source?
1: Animal Experimentation, 2007. Alix Favo, Greenhaven Press, 2004. http://ic.galegroup.com 'Chemical testing on animals is unreliable'	Testing on animals is unlikely to help humans because we are so different, and animals can have different reactions. Animals are kept in poor condition and go through stressful test and some end with diseases and even killed.	Reliable – presents a lot of information on different test and studies on animals and explains them clearly. It's from a press and taken from the EPIC data base. The author Alix Fano is director of the campaign for responsible transplantation and the author of Lethal Laws: Animal Testing, Human health and Environmental policy.

... sources 2 – 6 not included in this exemplar...

Forms developed conclusions

I decided to study animal testing after studying the film Never Let me Go, and thinking about the ethical issues it raises about scientific progress. I also read an interesting article 'Animal Experimentation Is Unscientific' by Javier Burgos, who is the president of the Nature of wellness which is an organization devoted to informing the public about the medical and scientific invalidity of animal experimentation and testing. This article describes with detail the different painful and cruel tests that animals go through and how they're treated as if they were lifeless objects, it's even a nightmare to imagine it. I chose this topic because I was surprised by the cruel things that animals have to go through and how people decide to ignore these things, just like in the film, where humans mostly ignored what was happening with the clones. My hypothesis is: **That animal testing is morally wrong and it doesn't really help humans. My key questions are: Why do we test on animals? What are the advantages / disadvantages of animal testing? (1)**

There are a wide range of products tested on animals. According to the article found on ic.galegroup.com 'Chemical testing on animals is unreliable' more than 85,000 products that are on the market are tested on animals,...(information given). Animals are also used in vaccine, drug and military tests which means they have to get lots of the most dangerous viruses or go through radiation, weapon and explosives testing (information given). After reading these two sources I was surprised at the huge range of products that were tested and just how many weren't related to medical progress.

“Animal testing is essential to drug and vaccine research. In particular animal experiments have been vital in discovering drugs that slow the progress of the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) the virus that causes AIDS. Similar advancements have occurred in developing treatments for herpes and hepatitis B, all of this because of animal testing,” says professor of laboratory medicine Rebecca Corey, the author of the article ‘Animal testing is essential for medical research’. According to another article found on ic.galegroup.com ‘Chemical testing on animals saves lives,’ “testing chemicals on animals helps protect human health. For example, studies have indicated that frogs and rats suffer adverse effects from pesticides such as atrazine, diazinon and dursban. Animal test results led to the banning of these products by the environmental agency.” This article made me think differently about my hypothesis, now I can see that animal testing can help humans in developing new vaccines or drugs against the most dangerous viruses such as AIDS, but I still think that there is a problem because animals have to suffer and die due to testing. (4)

According to the BBC Knowledge tv series, Pain, Pus and Poison, there have been huge changes in medicine over the last 150 years. This is because of experimentation. A huge killer of people was smallpox. The documentary stated that the vaccination for this was trialled on an 8 year old boy by first infecting him with cowpox then rubbing an open wound with pus from a smallpox patient. As the presenter stated, this was so risky and unethical! But it worked and smallpox, the world’s biggest killer of all time, was eliminated by the late twentieth century. Animal testing was shown in the search for a form of arsenic that could treat syphilis: this was done by injecting hundreds of rabbits. Over 600 rabbits would have died, but the one that lived with no ill-effects led directly to a treatment that saved people from a devastating disease.

This source was informative and gave me a historical perspective that I didn’t find in my other sources. It was interesting that it commented on the ethics of human testing only. (3) Sometimes animal testing seems to be the only way of finding out a solution to a medical problem. If it’s something as widespread and deadly as smallpox or AIDS then there is a justification for it. (4) A One News report (25/10/14) on Ebola showed an Australian laboratory that was doing research. There weren’t any animals in the news footage. When such deadly new viruses happen then the emphasis is on getting rid of it as fast as possible. According to ‘Did Scientists Just discover a cure for Ebola’ on ‘The Disease Daily’ website, “Researchers from the National Microbiology Laboratory in Winnipeg, Manitoba identified a number of antibodies that corresponded to proteins on the shell of the Ebola virus. They combined the antibodies into a specific cocktail and administered it to four macaques within 24 hours of infection. All four macaques survived. When the cocktail was administered within 48 hours of infection, two of four macaques survived.” The disease is spread by contact with infected animals. In the case of Ebola, I can’t find any sources that say that the harm to monkeys is worse than finding a cure.

What are the bad things about animal testing? According to the article found in ic.galegroup.com ‘Chemical testing on animals is unreliable’ mice are regularly used in chemical testing and their physiology, which is very different from humans, makes them inadequate and unreliable subjects. In a programme ‘Endocrine Disruptor screening programme’ 60,000 chemicals were tested on tens of millions of animals to determine whether and how chemicals disrupt human hormonal system, despite crucial differences in humans’ and animals’ endocrine systems. According to Ingrid Newkirk, Co-founder and president of the organization ‘People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals’ millions of animals suffer through stressful and unnecessary tests every year. Animals are kept in bad conditions and killed in painful and cruel ways during testing ... So if all of this is true why are we allowing it to happen? It links to the information gathered above. There needs to be clear regulations across the testing industry so that animals are harmed only where there is no other way of finding out. (4) After all the research I’ve done I have learned that animal testing has a positive and a negative side, but after reading several articles I realized that it’s a really huge issue that comes down to how we measure up the value of lives, human vs animal.

In conclusion I believe my hypothesis was partly right. However, I can see that not all tests are bad (4), some of them have a good cause and can actually help such as vaccine research tests. I don’t think animal testing is going to disappear but at least we must do something to improve it by (4) keeping animals in better conditions, trying to make the tests less painful and only do tests that are really necessary, like doing vaccine research in case a new threatening virus appears. (4) Animals may not think like we do, but after all they’re alive and can feel just like us.

	Grade Boundary: High Not Achieved
6.	<p>For Achieved, the student needs to use information literacy skills to form developed conclusion(s).</p> <p>The steps taken will include completing a systematic exploration into a valid area of inquiry by framing the inquiry, locating and processing information, and evaluating the information selected</p> <p>Students need to create and build conclusions connected to the inquiry and based on the information gathered.</p> <p>This student has begun to frame and conduct an inquiry into cruel animal farming practices by establishing a hypothesis and posing questions (1). Some appropriate strategies to locate and process information have been used, such as locating a range of sources, highlighting selected information and recording source details (2).</p> <p>The student has begun to form a conclusion (3) that is created from the gathered information. There is information (given as a summary, paraphrases, and quotations from cited sources) that is loosely linked to the student's own opinion and judgement.</p> <p>To reach Achieved, the student must frame the inquiry based on carefully considered information needs. Closed questions and sources from one viewpoint limit the exploration of the area of inquiry at curriculum level 7. The student must also develop conclusions from the information that has been gathered. Opinions expressed about the consequences of reduced meat consumption (4) need to be based on information gathered.</p>

Investigation topic: **Are farm animals being abused to an unreasonable standard?** (1)

What I already know: Farm animals are treated badly. Unclean troughs, not enough food, no shade.

What I need to find out: **How many animals a year are affected by this? Meat consumption.** (1)

Key questions: **how? What protections are in place?** (1)

Locating and processing information (2)

Printouts of several internet pages about animal farming practices submitted (not included in this exemplar).

Evaluating the reliability and usefulness of selected information (2)

Some printouts included a student comment: 'very useful', 'true/fairly useful', 'not that useful'

Forming developed conclusions

Are commercial farm animals being abused to an unreasonable standard in NZ? (1)

Animal abuse in commercial and factory farms is a growing problem on New Zealand and I believe people need to be made aware of this. Cows, pigs, chickens, lambs, goats, rabbits, bees, deer, horses and many more are being crammed into small cages and pens where they are unable to move around and get the freedom they deserve.

About a 6th of New Zealand's export earnings come from the dairy industry and a 10th from meat exports. Deer velvet and wool also contribute to a part of the export market. Over half the animals in the industry alone are being treated poorly, all to satisfy our appetites for meat. In 2006 (Animal protection society book by Catherine Amey) on average each person ate at least 37 kg of poultry, 34 kg of beef and 20 kg of pork, in NZ. It is now 2013 and the average amount of meat being consumed by each person a year is (ref by charts bin.com) between 93-138 kg in NZ. That is over a 200% increase in meat consumption within the last 7 years.

Over 100,000,000 animals are being slaughtered every year just to satisfy humans need to eat meat. Most humans believe that meat is our best source of food to get protein from ... *information from Wikipedia about protein levels of different foods* ... Now, I'm not saying we can't eat meat but **cutting down the amount 1 person eats every year by one half would help to show the meat industry does not need to kill animals so quickly in a way that is fast but inhumane. More commercial farmed animals would see the light of day and have more room to move in their pens, because the focus to mass produce meat products would lessen therefore more focus can be spent on the animals welfare and care.** (4)

The life of a dairy cow consists of a continuous cycle of pregnancy and lactation. They walk up to the milking shed which is generally 2-3 km away, twice a day and stand in the yard.... *Student gives information of the life cycle of a dairy cow and the treatment of them in NZ* ... This may sound bad for NZ but in some other countries (www.animalfreedom.org) such as Germany, Denmark and Spain cows are kept inside big sheds ... This also happens in New Zealand but is not seen as much as in other countries.

In 2005 the total amount of pigs killed at the end of the year was 765,000 (Animal protection society book). Around 60% of these pigs were confined in farrowing crates... *Student gives information about pig farming practices*

In New Zealand food products do not have to be labelled with their country of origin, and the pork that consumers buy may come from countries where the animal welfare standards are even worse than New Zealand's. In April 2007 Sue Kedgley the Green MP criticised Wairarapa Company Premier Bacon for selling bacon under the logo "Country goodness from the heart of Wairarapa". When in fact the bacon was actually imported from overseas.

Broiler chickens are chickens only bred for meat consumption. 77 million broiler chickens are farmed in NZ every year (animal protection society book). 90% of these are owned by just 3 cooperations ... *student gives information about chicken farming practices*

Factory farming in NZ is a growing problem (www.aspca.org). ASPCA is an organisation out there to help stop animal cruelty happening on farms. ASPCA.org is a website you can go to, to find out more about factory farming and how you can help the animals being mistreated on them ... Another NZ protection unit is the NZ Animal welfare organization (www.animalsandus.org.nz) ... *Student lists animal welfare organisations and gives some information about them.*

In conclusion, as it points out in the introduction, commercial and factory farming is a growing issue in New Zealand. **Animals such as, cows, pigs, chickens and many more are being treated inhumanly and cramped into tiny cages.** (3) If NZ does not open it's eyes to the fact that we are eating abused and chemically enhanced meat, then factory and commercial farming in NZ is only going to get worse.