

2023 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Home Economics
Level:	Level 2
Achievement standard(s)	91300, 91304

General 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 read the resources and applied and integrated their own knowledge to the contexts, provided some exceptional answers.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

Assessment

Candidates were required to answer one question with several parts.

- Parts (a) and (b) focused on how the given determinants of health impacted on the food choice for the Smith 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 the given determinants of health work together to improve or hinder the food choices and well-being of the Smith family.
- Part (e) asked candidates to demonstrate knowledge of the Smith family's situation and how this may impact other people and wider New Zealand society. An essay format discussion was expected in this answer.

Commentary

Candidates who gained higher grades tended to have definitions for part (a) and (b) and applied these in their writing of detailed answers related to the scenario.

Some candidates wrote more than was needed for the initial parts, which resulted in them repeating answers in the later parts.

When asked about the interconnections of the determinants of health, it is expected that candidates show understanding of how they work together to impact on food choices and well-being of the family, rather than disjointed and standalone answers for each determinant.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- gave an example of how well-being would be affected by a determinant of health, e.g. Tania's work hours allow her to forage for food with the children, allowing them to spend time together, therefore enhancing their social well-being
- demonstrated an understanding of how the relationship between a determinant of health affects food choices and well-being.

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

- explained, with some examples, how the determinants of health impact on food choices and well-being
- demonstrated an understanding of the context by providing relevant examples
- missed some of the details in the scenario about how the Smith family had access to healthy food, e.g. school breakfasts, a food bank, and cafe contributions.

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

- explained, with detailed examples, how the determinants of health (social support, work conditions, and access to healthy food) interconnected to improve the relationship between food choices and well-being for the Smith family
- demonstrated an understanding of the wider societal implications of the Smith family situation, e.g. Implications for families living on minimum wage
- demonstrated insight and comprehensive thinking about the long-term consequences of choices made by the Smith family on New Zealand society, e.g. benefits around reducing food waste, shopping locally, or eating healthy (or unhealthy) food.

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

- gave answers that were off topic
- demonstrated limited knowledge of the determinants of health and dimensions of well-being
- demonstrated limited understanding of the context provided
- failed to link food choices to well-being and dimensions of health.

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

Assessment

Candidates were required to answer one question with several parts.

- Parts (a), (b) and (c) asked candidates to explain the benefits and limitations of the three given strategies under the economic, social, and environmental factors.
- Part (d) asked candidates to consider the effectiveness of the strategies. Candidates were expected to demonstrate their knowledge of health promotion models, making connections to the given strategies. It was expected that the candidate's critical analysis would show an understanding of how these strategies would impact on the attitudes and values of those involved.

Commentary

Some candidates demonstrated confusion with the terms used, particularly the environmental factor which refers to physical access to the strategy, rather than litter or sustainability. Social well-being and social support were sometimes confused as being the same concept.

Some candidates repeated answers in the last part of the question at the expense of fully addressing the question.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- repeated information from the scenario, adding very little of their own explanation
- gave answers for only some of the benefits and limitations of the strategies
- demonstrated limited understanding of the health promotion models
- justified an answer without offering an opinion.

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

- clearly explained the benefits and limitations of at least two strategies
- showed an understanding of the social, economic, and environmental factors related to the strategies
- discussed the strategies in detail
- demonstrated limited application of the health promotion models to the given strategies.

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

- gave in-depth explanations with examples of the benefits and limitations of all three strategies
- answered all parts of the question in detail
- demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the health promotion models
- included consideration of people's attitudes and beliefs in their answers
- demonstrated critical thinking in relation to the effectiveness of the strategies.

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

- answered only some parts of the question
- wrote brief answers
- demonstrated limited understanding of the terminology used in relation to the benefits and limitations of the context of the scenario
- gave vague answers that were not related to the given scenario.