2025 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject: Agricultural and Horticultural Science

Level: 3

Achievement standard(s): 91530, 91531, 91532

General commentary

All three assessments gave candidates the opportunity to answer the questions using their own contexts. This gave the candidates the opportunity to show in-depth understanding of their chosen products. Candidates who did well, selected products that have current and relevant data, which was used as supporting evidence. Higher grades were not awarded to responses that appeared to be pre-prepared and did not link the concepts to their selected contexts.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 91530: Demonstrate understanding of how market forces affect supply of and demand for New Zealand primary products.

Assessment

This assessment consisted of one question, split into three parts. Candidates were expected to demonstrate understanding of how three market forces affect the supply of and / or demand for the chosen product. In Part C, the candidates were expected to discuss the significance of New Zealand trade agreements on supply of, and demand for, their chosen primary product.

Commentary

This assessment provided candidates with an opportunity to apply the contexts that they studied. Candidates who used the planning spaces wrote structured responses and clearly linked the market force on the supply and demand of their chosen product. Candidates who used a range of market forces and explained the impact on their chosen product, generally attained a higher grade.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- defined the market force that they selected, and linked it to their chosen product
- explained a real link between their chosen market force and supply or demand
- presented broad or theoretical responses that lack quantitative data of the effects on supply and / or demand.

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

- included quantitative data to explain the impact of a market force on the supply and demand of their chosen products. Specific quantities or volumes are used to indicate supply and quantities, price or value to indicate demand
- had a well-structured and organised response based on the question being asked.

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

- demonstrated understanding of a free trade agreement
- provided a well-structured and organised response by linking it back to a specific free trade agreement currently in place
- presented both qualitative and quantitative data to support their discussion of how free trade agreements impact on both supply and demand
- referred to supply of, and / or demand for the product as a result of a free trade agreement.

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

- demonstrated lack of understanding of their selected market force, and did not link it to the supply of or demand for their chosen product.
- wrote generalised responses that did not provide evidence of understanding of market forces, typically with no real link to supply or demand.

Achievement standard 91531: Demonstrate understanding of how the production process meets market requirements for a New Zealand primary product.

Assessment

This assessment consisted of one question, split into three parts. Candidates were required to demonstrate an understanding of the requirements of two chosen markets of a New Zealand primary product. For each market, candidates were required to demonstrate understanding of its market requirement and explain why a management practice is carried out to allow producers to produce products that meet the specific requirements of the markets. In part C, the candidates were required to demonstrate understanding of the most significant management practice for meeting the market requirements, and identified which had the greatest impact on the price received by the producer.

Commentary

This assessment provided candidates with the opportunity to select a product of their choice. Candidates who attained higher grades, showed detailed knowledge of the specific market requirements for their chosen primary product, and could link these market requirements to specific management practices. Candidates were encouraged to carefully choose their market to avoid using a brand or a product as a market for their response.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed understanding of specific market requirements in two different markets
- linked their understanding of how management practices are carried out to ensure that the desired market requirement is met
- did not use quantitative or qualitative data to explain the link between management practice and market requirements.

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

- presented quantitative data that directly matched the selected market requirements and management practice(s)
- explained the link between the market requirement and why it exists, and then explained a management practice that the farmer or grower uses to meet the market requirement.

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

- provided detail on how their chosen management practice had the most significant impact on meeting the market requirement
- used data to demonstrate how carrying out the management practice results in a higher price received by the producer
- presented their responses in a logical and organised manner.

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

- used production process management practice that is carried out off farm or off orchard.
- explained one market requirement
- did not link the management practice with the market requirement that they had explained.

Achievement standard 91532: Analyse a New Zealand primary production environmental issue.

Assessment

The assessment consisted of one question, split into three parts. Candidates were able to choose their own primary production system that best allowed them to analyse the environmental issue. Candidates were required to explain how their chosen production system had a negative impact on biodiversity. They were then asked to identify courses of action that producers could take to mitigate the negative effects or improve biodiversity. In Part C, candidates were asked to justify a course of action that had the greatest positive impact on biodiversity, while ensuring social, economic, and environmental sustainability of their production system.

Commentary

Candidates, who achieved well, could link the management practices used in the production of their chosen primary product to the loss on biodiversity in the environment. Higher grades were awarded to candidates who used technical terms and ideas to explain the impacts of production on biodiversity, e.g. effects on a food chain. They had specific details on courses of action that could mitigate the negative impacts of production on biodiversity, or that could improve it.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- explained how a chosen production system negatively impacted biodiversity but with no supporting evidence
- explained a course of action that mitigates the impact on biodiversity but with no supporting evidence.

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

- explained a management practice that negatively impacted biodiversity, as a result of the production system with quantitative data
- used scientific ideas to explain how habitats are negatively affected by management practices, causing biodiversity loss
- explained a course of action that mitigates the impact on biodiversity with quantitative data.

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

- discussed how the selected course of action improved biodiversity by linking social, economic, and environmental evidence to support the discussion
- gave a well-structured, thought out, response that presented evidence clearly and concisely.

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

- used a management practice that did not lead to an impact on biodiversity
- explained how a production system would cause GHG emissions, but made no link to biodiversity
- did not link the chosen course of action to mitigating the negative impacts of production on biodiversity, or on improving it.
