



New Zealand Qualifications Authority
Mana Tohu Matauranga O Aotearoa

Home > NCEA > Subjects > Assessment Reports > Health - L2

Assessment Report

Level 2 Health 2016

Standards [91235](#) [91238](#)

Part A: Commentary

Successful candidates used the stimulus material provided (resource booklet and scenario) to support their responses. They focused on the contexts provided, and demonstrated sound conceptual understanding. They understood that analysis comprised a combination of:

- factors that influenced the issue
- consequences for people's well-being as a result of the issue
- strategies to enhance well-being in relation to the issue.

Some candidates did not demonstrate the required conceptual understanding, e.g. confusing “social” with “societal”, and being unable to explain influences, consequences, and / or strategies at interpersonal and societal levels, focusing too heavily on personal aspects across the analysis.

The application of the underlying concept of health promotion needed further refinement. Societal strategies seldom reflected principles of effective health promotion. This could be strengthened, e.g. by explaining actions linked to healthy public policy, or collective action, rather than behaviour change actions such as putting up posters.

Part B: Report on Standards

91235: Analyse an adolescent health issue

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- explained personal, interpersonal, or societal influences on synthetic cannabis use
- explained short-term and long-term consequences of synthetic cannabis, covering personal, interpersonal, and societal consequences
- separated their explanation of personal consequences into four aspects of well-being, which often limited the depth of their answers

- provided strategies that addressed the consequences of Felix smoking synthetic cannabis (rather than the influencing factors)
- provided answers that were at times brief, general, repetitive, or in some cases, superficial
- included some evidence from the scenario and / or the resource booklet
- attempted all questions
- understood what the question was asking and the difference between personal, interpersonal, and societal.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- used evidence about cannabis or binge drinking, rather than synthetic cannabis
- referred only to personal consequences of synthetic cannabis, without mention of interpersonal or community well-being; and often over-relied on the consequences for the physical aspect of well-being
- listed strategies with no explanation, or suggested strategies that were unsuitable or unrealistic
- used bullet points, which limited their responses to an “identification”
- used information verbatim from the resource booklet and / or scenario, without adding their own explanation
- listed several influences and strategies, instead of focusing on one for each level: personal, interpersonal, and societal, and explaining it in-depth
- did not understand personal, interpersonal, and societal influences, consequences, and / or strategies.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- explained, in detail, personal, interpersonal, and societal influences on synthetic cannabis use
- explained short-term and long-term consequences on well-being, friends and / or family, and / or on the community
- connected the short-term consequences to the long-term consequences
- explained strategies related to the influences and justified how the strategies enhanced well-being
- supported their explanations with relevant evidence from the scenario and / or resources
- used their own statistics, or ensured they used evidence throughout the whole paper, from the resource booklet and scenario
- provided depth and understanding in their answers
- read and interpreted the question, and planned their answers.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- comprehensively explained how personal, interpersonal, and societal influences contributed to synthetic cannabis use
- explained, in detail, the personal, interpersonal, and societal consequences at a more critical level, and provided links between the consequences and the influencing factors
- provided a range of relevant evidence to strongly support arguments throughout the paper (from those provided and from their own learning)
- explained strategies that clearly addressed the influences and the consequences

- demonstrated thoughtful links to underlying concepts, e.g. being in-depth in their application of well-being and the determinants of health; referring to social justice
- developed strategies that were sometimes related to real health promotion strategies, or initiatives in New Zealand, and tailored these to fit the Felix scenario.

Standard-specific comments

Some candidates made assumptions about Felix and his family, or included personal information from their own experience using synthetic cannabis, which detracted from the analysis of the issue.

The interpersonal level seemed to be a weakness for many candidates, with answers for interpersonal aspects repeating what was also written at a personal or societal level.

91238: Analyse an interpersonal issue(s) that places personal safety at risk

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- understood personal, interpersonal, and community (Riverview College) aspects
- explained influences, short-term and long-term consequences, and strategies for the bullying issues
- attempted to integrate ideas from the resource booklet and / or scenario into their answers
- covered a range of ideas in each answer, rather than focusing on one key idea to develop into a clear explanation
- attempted all questions
- provided details about what each strategy involved, as well as some explanation on how the actions could, or attempt to, prevent cyberbullying
- understood what the question was asking and the difference between personal, interpersonal, and societal consequences.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- used bullet points, which limited their responses to an “identification”
- provided answers that were too brief and did not develop their idea(s) into an explanation(s)
- tried to cover too many ideas, rather than focus on key aspects to develop into explanations
- did not explain societal influences and / or consequences for bullying
- did not provide a health-enhancing strategy that the community could put in place.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- demonstrated a clear and in-depth understanding of personal, interpersonal, and societal aspects for the cyberbullying issue

- provided in-depth answers for short-term and long-term consequences for the well-being of Savannah, her friends, and the Riverview College community
- established links between influences, consequences, and / or strategies
- integrated ideas from the resource booklet and / or scenario into their answers
- explained, in some detail, health-enhancing personal, interpersonal, and community strategies to address the situation.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- demonstrated a comprehensive and broad understanding of personal, interpersonal, and societal aspects across all sections of the paper
- referred to the nature of the power imbalances relevant to the scenario and / or cyberbullying context
- connected their responses thoughtfully to information from the scenario and / or the resource material, and sometimes their own learning, to demonstrate a more critical understanding of cyberbullying
- established clear links between short-term and long-term consequences
- explained thoughtful consequences for the well-being of Savannah, her friends, and the Riverview College community, which were often linked to the influences explained in part (a)
- provided clear and in-depth explanations of health-enhancing strategies to prevent cyberbullying, which were often linked to the previously explained consequences and / or influences.

Standard-specific comments

The societal aspect was not generally understood and / or applied as well as personal and interpersonal aspects by candidates.

[Health subject page](#)

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority