

2024 NCEA Assessment Report

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

General commentary

Both standards were well received by candidates, with a good achievement rate. Good preparation was evident in the higher grades.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

Assessment

One question exam broken up into parts (a) to (e).

Commentary

Some candidates confused social gradient with social well-being in part (a). In part (b), several candidates just repeated information from the scenario rather than introducing explanations on ways Pritika could cope with her stress or make changes. The majority of candidates chose Pritika for this option.

Part (c) was answered well, showing candidates had a very good understanding of well-being. Occasionally, candidates only discussed exercise in the physical dimension, rather than how nutrients contribute to physical well-being, which was part of the question.

A significant number of candidates missed part (d). In part (e), candidates exhibited quite a wide range of thinking; candidates aptly linked the scenario to modern society, such as reducing global warming by using fewer food miles to cope with the high cost of everyday living.

Candidates often wrote about how older people are fragile and are unable to do things for themselves, which is quite a disconnect from what many older people are actually doing, such as leading active and connected lifestyles with little or some help. Such generalisations are discouraged.

Some candidates discussed food swamps and food deserts, which is an interesting concept and relevant to some areas of New Zealand.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- read and interpreted the questions accurately
- gave at least one determinant of health and a dimension of well-being, with a focus on food choice, connecting each of these together with at least one example; written evidence showed understanding and candidates began to analyse well-being within the given context
- showed good knowledge of well-being and at least one determinant of health relating to the scenario, and were able to provide some examples; evidence of nutritional understanding would have contributed to a higher grade.

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

- understood the requirements of the question parts
- understood the three determinants of health and demonstrated their understanding, providing at least two examples
- explained the determinants of well-being with relevant examples, incorporating their own ideas related to the resource
- answered all parts of the question with relevant details
- showed knowledge of well-being and determinants of health
- showed some knowledge of the importance of nutrients and their importance to physical well-being.

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

- provided their own ideas relating to the resource and responses, and showed a clear understanding of the determinants of health and well-being (at least three or four), which linked to food choices and the impact of well-being on decisions around food accessibility and affordability
- included insights into New Zealand society by presenting examples related to their own community environments
- wrote comprehensive, relevant, and insightful answers about the impact of food choices on New Zealand society; often including information learned in school lessons on the importance of nutrients in the body, nutrition guidelines, and serving sizes
- showed an in-depth understanding of both well-being and determinants of health that related directly to the scenario
- answered all parts of the question with detailed explanations.

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

- attempted questions very briefly and / or did not attempt some questions
 - wrote responses that were off topic and not related to the scenario
 - showed no understanding of well-being
 - gave little or no evidence, thereby showing little or no understanding of the questions asked; this was especially evident in the social gradient aspect.
-

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

Assessment

One question exam broken into parts to analyse three given strategies.

Commentary

Candidates are reminded that dark ink is needed as light colour pens do not scan well and the writing may not be legible.

Some candidates struggled to answer the social benefits correctly; limitations were generally answered well. Several candidates just rewrote the scenario in their own words without linking it to a benefit.

Candidates mostly gave the correct answers taken from the scenario for economic benefits and limitations for parts (a) and (b) (Group 1 and Group 2 strategies). The environmental (physical access) benefits and limitations for parts (a) and (b) (Group 1 and Group 2 strategies), were generally answered better than in previous years by many of the candidates. Using the words “have access to” or “access is easy because” showed good understanding, when used with an example. All benefits and limitations need to be attempted. There are ample examples in the scenarios given. Writing “there are none” or leaving a blank answer space automatically reduces the candidate’s chance of success.

Candidates are encouraged to use paragraphs, or bullet points if they are sitting the exam digitally.

Candidates are reminded not to use pre-learned answers that do not necessarily appear in the paper. The answers must have referential evidence from the scenarios provided.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- answered all of parts (a) and (b) by giving at least one correct example of benefits and limitations for social, economic, and environmental factors taken from the scenario
- answered part (c) by making a valid judgment on the effectiveness of one or two strategies
- compared part (a) with part (b) and chose the best one in their summary.

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

- answered all of parts (a) and (b), often giving a range of correct answers and examples from the scenario
- explained accurately and in some detail the effectiveness of the two strategies, making valid points and judgments relating to the given scenario; candidates also used their own words to demonstrate thinking, rather than copying directly from the resource
- compared part (a) with part (b) and chose the best one in their summary; sometimes suggestions for improvements were offered.

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

- answered all of parts (a) and (b), often giving many correct answers and examples from the scenario
- explained in detail about the effectiveness of the two strategies, making valid points and judgments relating to the given scenario; candidates used their own words to demonstrate thinking, with specific examples, rather than copying directly from the resource
- accurately linked their answer to definitions of the health promotion models, demonstrating deeper knowledge and understanding

- challenged the scenario and gave good options for improvement to the scenario, showing critical thinking, often giving several ideas and suggestions
- discussed attitudes and values of people involved with relevant examples.

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

- gave one limitation and one benefit to some of social, economic, or environmental factors
 - did not answer at least one strategy correctly over parts (a) and (b)
 - did not make a valid judgment for at least one strategy
 - only answered a small portion of the paper
 - did not address the question directly
 - made a judgment based on one strategy but did not complete parts (a) and (b) correctly.
-