

2024 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Health studies
Level:	1
Achievement standard(s):	92010, 92011

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 92010: Demonstrate understanding of factors that influence Hauora

Assessment

Candidates were required to respond to a scenario with multiple parts while also providing evidence of their own knowledge. They needed to identify and describe factors influencing the various family members in a scenario and explain how these factors were interrelated. Additionally, candidates were required to evaluate the significance of these factors and how they might impact the family's Hauora in the long term.

Commentary

This assessment required candidates to read and apply their knowledge to a scenario based around a family. The scenario was connected to three key learning areas: Food and Nutrition, Mental Health, and Relationships and Sexuality. Most candidates were able to discuss one or more of these areas to support their responses.

Candidates need more support in understanding how factors interrelate to demonstrate their understanding at the Merit level. Often, they simply discussed the impact on Hauora without explaining how one factor influenced another, led to another, or shared common themes. They did not appear to fully grasp the concept of interrelationships.

Those candidates who were able to explain how the factors interrelate often went on to achieve Excellence. This was achieved by evaluating the long-term implications (e) or assessing why certain factors had a greater influence than others (d).

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified factors that influenced the Hauora of the characters in the scenario
- described how their identified factors influenced some aspects of Hauora, using brief examples
- wrote short answers with little depth or explanation
- displayed limited ability to link to how the factors enhanced wellbeing.

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

- explained how and why their identified factors interrelated to influence Hauora. The candidate gave clear examples showing how two factors were connected or affected each other. For example, they explained how stress can lead to poor sleep, and how lack of sleep can then impact mental health
- showed an understanding of how different factors worked together to influence Hauora
- used relevant examples from the scenario to best support their answer/s
- linked influencing factors to demonstrate how these enhanced Hauora and how they would work well together (interrelate)
- explained how the influencing factors interrelated and how this could lead to positive changes and influence wellbeing (Hauora).

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

- evaluated the factors that had the greatest influence on the family's Hauora
- evaluated how the family's Hauora would be impacted in the long term due to the identified factors
- used the resource well and demonstrated their own ideas in questions d) and e)
- demonstrated critical thinking and insightfulness, showing insight or maturity in their responses
- provided a range of relevant evidence (from the scenario and / or their own knowledge) to strongly support their ideas throughout the response.

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

- identified factors, but did not say how this was influencing Hauora
- provided short bullet points
- missed out questions or left them unanswered
- discussed strategies, rather than factors
- rewrote the scenario.

Achievement standard 92011: Demonstrate understanding of strategies that enhance Hauora

Assessment

Candidates effectively described health-enhancing strategies that successfully increased the well-being of individuals, involved directly and indirectly in the scenario. Most students were able to identify this and explain it according to the question.

Commentary

In general, the reports showed a solid understanding of health-enhancing strategies and their positive effects on people's Hauora, as well as how these strategies could positively influence attitudes and values. Overall, candidates' responses were written well and met the report requirements. The report enabled students to answer the paper in a format that worked for them individually. For example, some answered each question separately, while others combined their answers throughout.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- described influences and factors contributing to the personal and interpersonal reasons for the students' situation, often recapping the scenario in detail. However, they provided limited strategies, with some offering only one detailed strategy. Occasionally, strategies were vague and lacked specifics on implementation, such as the suggestion to 'put yourself first'
- outlined three strategies (one incorrect or weak) or doubled up, e.g. two societal strategies
- rewrote aspects of the scenario, rather than use the scenario for examples, which led to minimal depth responding to the three questions
- displayed limited ability to link how the strategy would enhance wellbeing, or failing to link to any other underlying concept, apart from Hauora

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

- accurately identified strategies as personal, interpersonal and societal and discussed how Hauora is enhanced by the identified strategies
- used relevant examples from the scenario to best support their answer
- provided at least two or more well-described health-enhancing strategies. Their references to the scenario were detailed, illustrating how the strategies might positively impact both the students and others involved
- suggested utilising the expertise of family, school, or health experts to gain understanding and support in implementing the chosen strategies. The descriptions demonstrated an understanding beyond the two students in the scenario, showing how others could also be positively impacted
- supported points made throughout the report with relevant examples from the scenario.

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

- provided thoughtful insights into the impact of the strategies on the broader community and skilfully interweaved underlying concepts within the connected strategies, creating a comprehensive and cohesive response. The descriptions demonstrated an understanding of how underlying concepts increased health promotion, benefiting many people and society
- illustrated how individuals, others, and society could work together to provide support and collective action to enhance Hauora
- linked strategies together e.g. personal to interpersonal
- linked strategies clearly to another underlying concept other than Hauora, e.g. Attitudes and Values or health promotion
- included strategies that enhanced society, such as creating and collaborating within a community garden, becoming involved in local food banks, and increasing awareness of the positive impact students could have on the wider community
- provided a range of relevant evidence to strongly support arguments throughout the paper
- were thoughtful, critical and insightful in their responses
- provided critical insights to show how people's actions and positive changes in behaviour, policies, education, and social dynamics could benefit more than just the individuals involved. The strategies detailed their impact on wider society and some underlying concepts.

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

- wrote bullet-pointed or numbered lists for their strategies with no description or detail
- provided incorrect strategies or doubled up e.g. two personal strategies, or the strategies were not strategies
- did not link their response to the scenario or provide examples from the scenario
- did not reference Hauora, Attitudes and Values or relevant underlying concepts
- started explaining one strategy but gave limited and sometimes non-relevant details about the strategy
- explained influencing factors with very little detail on the actual strategies and how they might support Hauora and positive change
- did not provide a succinct explanation
- submitted an incomplete report
- used their own opinion or gave general advice which was not specific to the scenario
- provided strategies that were general or not strategies / actions, for example, a personal strategy for Morgan was to have more self-control.