

## Level 2 Home Economics 2018

Standards [91300](#) [91304](#)

### Part A: Commentary

Candidates who thoroughly read the question(s) and given resources before attempting all parts of the paper were able to demonstrate understanding of the standards in relation to the context of the scenarios. It is important that candidates focus on answering the overarching question. Bullet points or emphasised words are only given to help provide guidance on the points that will enhance their answer.

Successful candidates demonstrated a clear understanding by referring specifically to the resource material and showing their knowledge of the relevant concepts.

### Part B: Report on standards

#### **91300: Analyse the relationship between well-being, food choices and determinants of health**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- explained a determinant(s) of health
- explained a dimension(s) of well-being
- gave a brief example to support their explanation.

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

- did not explain well-being in their answers
- did not explain their answers to show understanding of how food choices affect the well-being of the family
- misunderstood the social gradient determinant.

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

- explained two or more determinants of health and two dimensions of well-being
- provided detailed examples that included how the information in the scenario relates to the family and the effect it has on them
- showed understanding of the impact of food choice by demonstrating relevant nutrition and nutrient knowledge
- used information given in the scenario to discuss the impact on well-being example, how the grandparents are introducing the twins to fresh food/nutrients and how this contributes to social and spiritual well-being.

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

- provided interconnections between determinants of health, food choices and three or more dimensions of well-being
- provided detailed examples that were linked to the effect on the Hayes family and New Zealand society as a whole

- provided detailed information on relevant nutrients.

### Standard specific comments

Some candidates were confused about the social gradient determinant and digressed in their responses about social support. Candidates are expected to directly relate their answers to the given scenario provided in the resource material. Some candidates appeared to give pre-prepared answers using generic examples which did not help them.

---

## 91304: Evaluate health promoting strategies designed to address a nutritional need

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- described how their chosen strategy encouraged teenagers to eat well
- made a valid judgement based on the effectiveness of one of the chosen strategies
- provided a limitation and benefit of one strategy
- displayed a basic knowledge of the determinants of health (social support, economic and environmental).

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

- wrote about the benefits of a strategy, and did not write about the limitations
- demonstrated limited understanding of the determinants of health and health promotion models
- presented their answers in lists and the ideas were not discussed or explained
- wrote brief responses
- copied information from the resource booklet without adding extra information.

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

- provided a detailed explanation, with supporting evidence, of how their chosen strategies could encourage teenagers to eat well
- linked the determinants of health back to the limitations and benefits of each strategy
- demonstrated in-depth knowledge of how social, economic and environmental factors impacted on the effectiveness of the strategies
- compared the different factors that each strategy has in terms of both benefits and limitations
- linked their answers to people's attitudes and values towards food choices, healthy eating and well-being.

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

- demonstrated a clear understanding of the three health promotion models, connecting the strategies to these models
- clearly and comprehensively compared the strategies, and challenged their effectiveness across a wide range of people before making a judgement
- used relevant and accurate evidence from the resource booklet to support their arguments and reach valid conclusions
- explained people's attitudes and values towards food choice, healthy eating and well-being

- supported their explanation of their decision, having processed the rationale behind it, with their own relevant opinions and knowledge.

### **Standard specific comments**

Candidates should understand that evaluate means to be able to explain limitations and benefits for the strategies. Some candidates only discussed benefits for their preferred strategy and only limitations for their less preferred strategy.

Candidates are reminded to thoroughly read all the strategies given before answering the question. Their discussion of the strategies should be focussed on the relevant social, economic and environmental (physical access to the strategy) factors that impact on the people involved in the strategy.

When asked to 'justify' some candidates interpreted that to mean they only needed to write about one strategy.

[Home Economics subject page](#)

### **Previous years' reports**

[2017](#), [2016](#)