

**Subject:** Health

**Level:** 2

**Standards:** 91235, 91238

## Part A: Commentary

Both examinations provided clear questions and relevant topics for candidates to answer. Candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the issues chosen for each examination. The scenarios and resources provided good reference points for candidates to use in the examination. Candidates were often able to link their experience as well as utilise the resources and scenarios provided. In “91235 Analyse an adolescent health issue”, it was noted that offering examples of strategies within the assessment assisted candidates to craft good answers that would be health enhancing for all involved. Overall, both examinations provided all candidates with the opportunity to achieve the standards.

## Part B: Report on standards

### 91235: Analyse an adolescent health issue

#### Examination

The scenario provided a wide range of key ideas that the candidates were able to use to answer the examination questions. Most candidates were able to identify key ideas in the scenario.

#### Observations

Some candidates were not concise with their level of detail and over responded to questions. Some parts of the question were not answered. In some cases, scenarios and resources were repeated in the answer.

Some candidates wrote about personal, interpersonal, and societal influences instead of influences of people (interpersonal) in Joe’s life. Some candidates identified favourite basketball players as an interpersonal influence.

Candidates who did not perform well in part (a) did not link their explanation with how it influenced Joe’s eating habits. For example, describing the impact of social media on teens in general.

In general, candidates answered part (b) with detail - they were able to answer using a range of evidence from the resource and identify short- and long-term effects.

Some candidates wrote about how media influenced teens rather than the how the wider community is affected by poor eating habits of teenagers.

In part (c), some candidates selected a strategy from Resource E and were able to apply to Joe's situation with detail but struggled to make links to other teens and community.

To gain higher grades, candidates needed to apply critical thinking and provide explanations.

### **Grade awarding**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- explained interpersonal and / or societal influences that affected Joe's eating habits
- explained consequences for Joe and / or society in the short term and/or long term
- provided answers that were at times brief, general or in some way superficial and lacking specific detail
- did not link responses for parts (a), (b) and (c)
- provided personal, interpersonal, and societal explanations throughout the response
- gave a range of influences, strategies, or actions but with limited explanation
- quoted resource material but did not use it to add detail to their explanation
- provided responses as a series of standalone statements rather than paragraph answers
- applied a given strategy and explained how it was health enhancing for Joe and / or other teens and the community.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- responded with bullet point lists
- listed actions with little or no explanation on how they were health-enhancing
- provided strategies that were not strategies, or were weak such as "Joe should just start eating breakfast"
- did not use the scenario specifically
- repeated the scenario or just rewrote it, but did not address the questions
- listed a range of answers throughout the examination with no explanation
- submitted incomplete responses.

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

- explained, in depth interpersonal and / or societal influences that affect Joe's eating habits
- explained, in depth, impacts that eating habits may have on Joe and / or in the community short-term and long-term

- demonstrated how short-term linked to the long-term consequences – from being a young person into adulthood and beyond
- explained how the factors linked to the consequences
- explained, in detail actions / strategies and how the strategies promoted well-being at a personal, interpersonal and / or societal level
- linked strategies in part (c) to the influences they wrote about in part (a) and consequences in part (b)
- supported their written answers with relevant evidence from the scenario and/or resources
- began the process of critical thinking in their response/s and utilised the underlying concepts of health in particular hauora
- applied a strategy and explained, in detail, how it could promote healthy well-being for Joe and others, and explained how the strategy is health enhancing.

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

- explained in detail, personal, interpersonal, and societal factors influencing Joe, his mother and his friends
- explained in detail the personal, interpersonal, and societal consequences at a more critical level and provided links within the consequences and to answers provided in (a)
- showed thoughtful understanding of the underlying concepts of health in particular hauora, attitudes and values, socio ecological perspective and health promotion
- selected a strategy in part (c) which clearly linked to answers in part (a) and (b)
- provided a range of relevant evidence to strongly support arguments throughout the response
- demonstrated critical understanding of the underlying concepts.

## **91238 Analyse an interpersonal issue which puts personal safety at risk**

### **Examination**

The international health issue for this examination was relevant and topical for candidates. Many candidates were able to answer all three questions in the examination.

### **Observations**

Candidates overall conveyed a good level of understanding of the influences, consequences and detailed health enhancing strategies.

Most candidates answered all the questions in some level of detail that demonstrated good understanding of the issue.

Candidates found part (b) straight forward and provided short-term and long-term consequences.

Candidates provided good strategies in part (c) of the examination, but there was a noticeable lack of detail in responses.

Some candidates struggled to connect personal, interpersonal, and societal factors that influence discrimination based on sexual orientation.

### **Grade awarding**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- provided some explanations and answers for personal, interpersonal, and societal influences
- described each factor briefly
- provided answers which lack depth, with little explanation as to how the influences might lead to discrimination
- provided some short-term and long-term consequences of discrimination
- overlooked the broader implications towards people and the community's well-being.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- provided insufficient detail to meet the standard
- did not answer all parts of the question
- did not describe any healthy enhancing strategies to prevent discrimination
- provided responses with limited influences and consequences of discrimination.

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

- provided an in-depth understanding of influences that can affect discrimination
- identified clearly that people's personal beliefs, values and experiences could influence their view towards people with different sexual orientation as their own
- identified wider societal and cultural norms and factors that could contribute to discrimination
- explained clearly many short-term and long-term effects both for people in the scenario and outside the scenario. The descriptions of short-term effects of discrimination clearly linked to the long-term consequences for those involved
- provided detailed explanations of health enhancing strategies and how the strategies could increase the profile of differences and decrease people's negative opinions and approaches towards others.

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

- linked influences and consequences
- articulated how their chosen health strategy or strategies would positively promote and make a difference for those in the scenario and wider community

- demonstrated critical understanding of personal, interpersonal, and societal, social influences in explanations as to why people discriminate
  - provided insightful understanding as to why people might discriminate and how this could impact people and society.
-