

## Assessment Report

# Level 2 Health 2017

Standards **91235** **91238**

### Part A: Commentary

The scenario provided a range of avenues for candidates to approach the questions and answer them with depth. There was a good range of examples candidates could use for personal, interpersonal and societal.

The accompanying resource booklet made great links to the scenario and most of the candidates used the resources frequently to help reference their work in a range of questions. Combined, the resource booklet and scenario provided enough for the candidates to use for answering each aspect of the paper.

A planning page was provided for candidates, and this really helped those who used it, to answer the questions in a very clear way. The majority would set out with the personal answer, then the interpersonal and then the societal, rather than a mixture within a paragraph for each of the required sections. Some candidates misread the questions and answered incorrectly (e.g. consequences in the influences section).

Each question was very clear on what needed to be covered (personal, interpersonal and societal), however, rather than writing with detail, some would try to cover the five characters in the scenario briefly (i.e. give a lot of brief personal influences for each character) or would rewrite the scenario as their answer to the influence question.

### Part B: Report on standards

#### 91235: Analyse an adolescent health issue

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- explained personal, interpersonal and/or societal influences on the relationships of the adolescents in the scenario
- explained short term and long-term consequences of the relationship conflicts for the well-being of individuals in the scenario, those they interact with and/or the community
- provided clear strategies that could be used to manage, maintain or enhance relationships at a personal, interpersonal and/or societal level.
- provided some detail on why they were health enhancing
- provided answers that were at times brief, general or in some way superficial
- provided personal, interpersonal and societal explanations throughout the examination

- understood the difference between influences and consequences
- understood the difference between personal, interpersonal and societal.
- wrote only about personal consequences, often including an in-depth description of all four aspects of hauora, and not interpersonal and societal
- did not include both short AND long-term consequences.

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

- wrote in bullet point form
- did not use the scenario provided at all to answer questions but would give general answers
- briefly listed a number of influences with no detail or explanation of why they were an influence
- rewrote the scenario without showing an understanding of why each aspect was an influence
- mixed personal and interpersonal explanations in influences and strategies
- showed no understanding of societal. Examples given for societal influences, consequences or strategies were often weak or incorrect and were interpersonal
- listed strategies with no explanation on how it was health enhancing
- provided strategies that were weak; for example, Mason should use good communication
- did not complete the paper
- wrote about consequences in the influences section and did not answer influences correctly
- did not understand personal, interpersonal and societal (especially societal)
- arrived at unjustified and extreme conclusions.

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

- explained in detail, personal, interpersonal and/or societal influences on the relationships of the adolescences from the scenario
- explained in detail, short term and long-term consequences of the relationship conflicts for the individuals in the scenario, those they interact with and/or the community
- showed how short term linked to the long-term consequences
- explained how the influences linked to the consequences
- explained strategies in detail, and how the strategies promoted well-being at a personal, interpersonal and/or societal level
- supported arguments with relevant evidence from the scenario and/or resources.

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

- explained in detail, personal, interpersonal and societal influences on the relationships of the adolescents in the scenario
- explained in detail the personal, interpersonal and societal consequences at a more critical level and often provided links within the consequences and to answers provided in (a)
- provided a range of relevant evidence to strongly support arguments throughout the paper from the resource booklet and sometime their own sources
- chose strategies that were the most critical and justified why the strategies were health-enhancing
- the strategies clearly addressed the influences mentioned in (a) and made connections to the consequences in (b)
- completed all sections to a high standard
- planned work prior to writing.

### **Standard specific comments**

Candidates needed to cover and demonstrate understanding of personal, interpersonal and societal perspectives throughout the paper. Often candidates showed a weakness in one of these areas (mostly societal) which prevented them from achieving this standard.

Some candidates wrote about personal experiences in relationships and with stress. Candidates should be encouraged not to use 'I' statements.

Candidates are encouraged to use the planning page to help them write a concise and clear answer.

Candidates need to answer all three questions in order to achieve.

Some candidates were writing out of context eg 'Mason is a shark' and not explaining what this means.

---

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

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified and explained influences, consequences and strategies related to Padraig and people in the workplace. Societal influences and workplace strategies often lacked detail/understanding.
- gave some answers that were not correct. Often 'personal' strategies and interpersonal strategies.
- did not use the resource booklet.

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

- did not provide enough detail about the influences and strategies for societal/workplace. Not enough detail in most questions to meet the standard
- sometimes answered all the questions and identified brief influences/ consequences and limited strategies however did not provide any detailed explanation and links from the scenario
- did not acknowledge the social ecological perspective. They just wrote about influences, consequences and strategies.

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

- clearly understood influences, consequences and strategies towards the people/workplace in the scenario. Explained some of the underlying concepts
- used the resource booklet to assist answers
- showed some clear links between personal, interpersonal, societal
- compared characters and effects
- explained well-being and recognised as isolated ideas.

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

- clearly described in great detail influences, consequences and strategies towards everybody involved in the scenario. Identified and explained in detail the underlying concepts relating to the bullying/harassment scenario
- explained how the socio-ecological perspective influenced bullying. Linked this to consequences for the characters in the scenario and found strategies to enhance well-being.
- wove well-being for people involved in the situation, in to many answers.

### **Standard specific comments**

In Question (a) the candidates often struggled with the personal influences. Some identified Padraig's accent as a problem.

## **[Health subject page](#)**

### **Previous years' reports**

[2016 \(PDF, 0KB\)](#)

---

---

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority