

**Subject:** Home Economics

**Level:** 2

**Standards:** 91300, 91304

## Part A: Commentary

To achieve at a high level, candidates were required to answer all parts of the question in detail, providing clear and specific examples with reference to the scenarios provided with the paper.

Candidates who carefully tailored their responses to the questions and provided specific evidence gained higher grades. It is important to understand that the questions and scenarios will vary from year to year so rote-learned answers are unlikely to meet the requirements to achieve.

## Part B: Report on standards

**AS91300: Analyse the relationship between well-being, food choice and determinants of health**

### Examination

The examination had one question segmented into five parts.

- Part (a) and (b) focused on how the given determinants of health impacted on the food choice for the family in the scenario.
- Part (c) asked candidates to explain the impact of these food choices on well-being. It was expected that candidates refer to and name all four dimensions of well-being in their answer.
- Part (d) asked candidates to explain how food choice, well-being, and the three given determinants of health are interconnected. The emphasis was on how these given determinants of health work together to improve or hinder the food choices and well-being of the family in the scenario.
- Part (e) asked candidates to demonstrate knowledge of the family's situation and how this may impact on other people and wider New Zealand society.

### Observations

The majority of candidates gave full answers and showed good knowledge about well-being and the determinants of health.

Candidates who gave detailed examples to support their explanations tended to show deeper knowledge of the concepts.

Some candidates did not relate well-being back to the actual food choices of the family.

When candidates are asked about interconnections, it is expected that they show understanding of how all three aspects work together including the complexity of this relationship on individuals, families, and society. Some candidates' answers were repetitive, especially if they weren't clear about the social gradient determinant of health, and repeated explanations from previous questions did not help the candidate score a higher grade.

Some candidates discussed the social situation the family were in without connecting these ideas to food choice and explaining how this would impact on well-being. Reading and answering all questions carefully will ensure that these connections are made.

### **Grade awarding**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- explained at least one dimension of well-being
- explained the determinants of health – access to healthy food and transport
- provided examples and explained the food choices to support answers
- related their answers back to the scenario.

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

- wrote brief answers that lacked evidence of knowledge about the dimensions of well-being and the determinants of health
- did not address all parts of the question
- did not give examples of food choices to explain their understanding
- did not demonstrate sufficient understanding of the topic.

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

- explained clearly how the family's well-being was affected by the given determinants of health
- supported their explanation with detailed examples of food choices
- explained more than one dimension of well-being with detailed examples.

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

- explained with examples how the determinants of health interconnect to improve the relationship between food choice and well-being
- explained the wider societal implications of the family's situation
- explained long term consequences of the family's situation.

## **AS91304: Evaluate health promoting strategies designed to address a nutritional need**

### **Examination**

The examination had one question segmented into three parts.

- Part (a) and (b) required candidates to explain the benefits and limitations of two of the given strategies and suggest how effective these strategies would be at encouraging better snack choices.
- Part (c) asked candidates to discuss the effectiveness of the *Snack Better* campaign at encouraging children and their families to improve their snacking food habits. Candidates were expected to demonstrate their knowledge of the health promotion models by explaining and making valid connections to all the strategies within the campaign. It was expected that their discussion demonstrate an understanding of how these strategies would impact on the attitudes and values of those involved.

### **Observations**

It is important for candidates to understand key words used in the examination as per the explanatory notes in the Achievement Standard, particularly explanatory note 4. Candidates showed some confusion with the environmental determinant of health, referring to sustainability issues rather than the physical access of the strategy, e.g. families living close to the preschool, so the information evening is easy to access.

Candidates are expected to explain the information in the scenario rather than just repeat or copy several lines.

Candidates are required to 'challenge the effectiveness of the strategy/ies' to gain excellence. This does not necessarily mean they need to give a compare and contrast type response in part (c). Their answer should be guided by the question rather than relying on providing rote-learned responses that may have been a part of the previous year's question.

Candidates who were able to explain the impact on the attitudes and values of the people involved gained higher grades.

### **Grade awarding**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- explained at least one benefit and limitation for one strategy
- described only part of the required answers
- did not demonstrate understanding of the social, economic, and environmental factors

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

- wrote brief and vague answers
- did not complete all parts of the question

- wrote explanations not related to the scenario
- did not demonstrate understanding of the terminology used, e.g. benefits and limitations.

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

- showed an understanding of social, economic, and environmental factors in their explanation of the benefits and limitations
- explained parts (a) and (b) with an in-depth explanation
- identified possible challenges with the strategies
- did not address all three strategies in part (c)
- lacked an explanation of the impact on attitudes and values of the people involved.

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

- showed a comprehensive understanding of the terminology used in the question
  - answered all parts (a-c) of the question in detail, showing critical thinking
  - gave in-depth benefits and limitations with examples for social, economic, and environmental factors with respect to the scenario
  - explained possible challenges with the strategies
  - explained people's attitudes and values related to the strategies
  - discussed the health promotion models in relation to all the strategies within the campaign.
-