

2025 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Health Education
Level:	2
Achievement standard(s):	91235, 91238

General commentary

Each assessment required candidates to analyse a health issue along with supporting resources. Candidates completed the analysis by responding to a question in multiple parts, supported by evidence from the resources and their own learning.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 91235: Analyse an adolescent health issue

Assessment

The assessment required analysing the adolescent health issue of excessive screen time, which was relevant and topical for candidates. The resource booklet was well utilised overall. Those who were successful responded accurately to the questions and demonstrated a clear understanding of personal, interpersonal, and societal influences, consequences, and strategies.

Commentary

In general, candidates demonstrated an understanding of the influencing factors in relation to the issue. However, there was a common misunderstanding of where social media fits as an influence, and this was often explained across all three levels. Social media is predominantly a societal influence.

Successful candidates demonstrated sound understanding of short- and long-term societal consequences for well-being. Explained consequences need to be negative rather than positive.

Candidates achieved at the higher levels by linking their strategy responses to either the influencing factors or some of the consequences. Influencing factors must be addressed, along with an explanation of how the impacts will be minimised with positive health outcomes. Candidates are not required to explain negative consequences of the recommended strategies.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- described personal, interpersonal, and / or societal influences in relation to the issue
- explained either short-term personal impacts or long-term societal impacts
- explained personal, interpersonal, and / or societal health-enhancing strategies to minimise excessive screen time

- incorporated some information from the resource booklet, providing some explanation after quoting material
- explained factors with some inconsistencies or inaccuracies.

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

- explained personal, interpersonal, and / or societal influences in relation to the issue in depth
- explained impacts for personal short-term well-being and societal long-term consequences with some links to the influences mentioned
- explained personal, interpersonal, and / or societal strategies and provided links to either the influences mentioned or consequences to well-being
- used the information provided in the resource booklet with further explanation from their own knowledge and understanding to support their answers.

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

- demonstrated in-depth understanding of personal, interpersonal, and societal factors throughout
- comprehensively explained the short-term consequences for individuals and showed insight throughout their explanation of impacts to the wider New Zealand community in the long term
- explained personal, interpersonal, and / or societal strategies which explicitly addressed the influencing factors in depth, and explained how these would effectively minimise the consequence to well-being and enable health-enhancing outcomes
- linked their strategy responses to both the influencing factors and the consequences explicitly
- used the resource material critically, along with their own knowledge, to support their ideas

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

- provided brief descriptions (sometimes listed straight from the resource) that lacked explanation
- left some questions or parts unaddressed, in particular the impacts to the wider New Zealand community and the interpersonal and societal strategies
- provided short responses of the societal or wider community long-term impacts, often repeating personal short term impacts, but for “many teenagers”.

Achievement standard 91238: Analyse and interpersonal issue(s) that places personal safety at risk

Assessment

The examination required candidates to analyse the interpersonal issue of power imbalance in relationships. The majority of candidates demonstrated an understanding of the influences, consequences, and strategies to achieve the standard.

Commentary

Candidates commonly demonstrated a clear understanding of the influences, short- and long-term consequences, and strategies that could impact people in the scenario and others in relation to the topic as it relates to well-being.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- described personal, interpersonal, and / or societal factors influencing the power imbalance, perhaps with some inconsistencies or inaccuracies

- described a short-term and a long-term consequence to the well-being of the victim in the relationship
- described a relevant personal or interpersonal health-enhancing strategy and a societal health-enhancing strategy that could be implemented to enhance the well-being of those in the scenario.

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

- explained personal, interpersonal, and / or societal factors influencing the power imbalance in depth
- explained short- and long-term consequences to the well-being of the victim in the relationship in depth
- explained a relevant personal or interpersonal health-enhancing strategy and a societal health-enhancing strategy that could be implemented to enhance the well-being of those in the relationship, in relation to the influences or consequences previously discussed
- provided links within responses to the scenario and the resource material, with further explanation from their own knowledge and understanding.

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

- demonstrated an in-depth understanding of personal, interpersonal, and / or societal factors that influence power imbalance
- explained short- and long-term consequences to the well-being of the victim comprehensively – some explained how the victim’s well-being was impacted both directly and indirectly
- explained personal, interpersonal, and / or societal strategies that explicitly addressed the influencing factors previously discussed, and explained comprehensively how these would effectively minimise the consequences to well-being for those directly and indirectly involved in the relationship
- made reference to the scenario and resources consistently throughout their response
- demonstrated critical understanding of the underlying concepts of health, for example, often the strategy referred to the concept of social justice.

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

- listed consequences straight from the resource without further explanation
- confused personal, interpersonal, and societal influences
- neglected to address the long-term consequences to well-being.