

# 2025 NCEA Assessment Report

<b>Subject:</b>	Health Studies
<b>Level:</b>	1
<b>Achievement standard(s):</b>	92010, 92011

## General commentary

The examinations required candidates to explain a health issue presented in a scenario. The scenarios offered a wide variety of contexts that candidates could use to show their understanding. Candidates were expected to analyse the given scenario to demonstrate their knowledge of the factors influencing hauora or to identify strategies that support hauora.

## Report on individual achievement standard(s)

### **Achievement standard 92010: Demonstrate understanding of factors that influence hauora**

#### Assessment

Candidates had to address a multi-part scenario and demonstrate their understanding. They were asked to identify and explain the factors affecting a Year 11 student, Sara, who has a food allergy and is preparing to attend a school camp. Candidates needed to assess the importance of the influencing factors by discussing how they could affect Sara in the short term, as well as the potential long-term effects on her family and the wider school community.

#### Commentary

Candidates were required to apply their knowledge to a range of resources relating to the scenario. Most candidates connected their ideas to the scenario and demonstrated an understanding of the health issue presented. However, some candidates needed to clearly identify and link their ideas back to the relevant factors. Some candidates confused factors with consequences, strategies, or dimensions of hauora, which limited the depth of their responses and ability to meet the standard.

At Achievement level, candidates typically described the factors and described how they influenced one or more dimensions of hauora. For Merit, candidates needed to explain how different factors worked together to influence the teenager's wellbeing. Many candidates discussed factors in isolation or listed them, rather than showing how one factor influenced or contributed to another. Candidates who demonstrated an understanding of how factors worked together were more likely to achieve at Excellence level. This was often shown through evaluating the short- and long-term implications of the allergy and peer pressure on the teenager's hauora, or by assessing why certain factors had a greater influence than others. Strong responses clearly linked evidence from the resources to the scenario and demonstrated a coherent understanding.

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- correctly identified factors from the scenario
- wrote short answers with little depth or explanation
- stated or identified, rather than describing and explaining
- used brief examples or quotes from the resources.

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

- gave clear examples showing how two factors were connected or affected each other
- used relevant examples from the scenario to best support their answers
- linked influencing factors to demonstrate how these enhanced hauora and how and why they would work together (interrelate).

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

- included more than one factor in (c) and (d)
- used clear sentence starters and structure
- evaluated interrelationships, drawing conclusions
- showed clear justification and insight in their answers, which were detailed and cohesive
- went beyond the information provided and built upon the interconnection of the factors
- drew conclusions about how the factors from the scenario influenced Sara's hauora in both the short term and long term
- evaluated and discussed in detail the factors leading to the unintended consequences for Sara AND her family's hauora
- categorised the factors as personal, interpersonal, and societal
- provided a range of relevant evidence (from the scenario and / or their own knowledge) to strongly support their ideas.

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

- left blank spaces
- wrote about strategies, not factors
- stated a factor without describing how it influenced hauora
- copied or reworded irrelevant information from the scenario without answering the questions
- introduced new, incorrect information.

---

## Achievement standard 92011: Demonstrate understanding of strategies that enhance hauora

### Assessment

Most candidates effectively described health-enhancing strategies that successfully increased the hauora of individuals involved directly and indirectly in the scenario.

### Commentary

In general, candidates 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. In general, most candidates identified a range of personal, interpersonal, and

societal strategies and allocated them to the correct category, going on to discuss why the strategy enhanced hauora.

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified two strategies (personal, interpersonal, and / or societal) across part (a) or (b) and described how these would enhance hauora
- displayed some understanding of how the strategy would enhance wellbeing, but without linking to any underlying concept other than hauora
- described some strategies incompletely
- explained some steps they would take to implement their strategies
- explained some links to hauora, but often in a generalised way
- made some good strategy suggestions to enhance the hauora of the person of the scenario, but without describing how effective those strategies would be.

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

- showed links between at least two strategies and explained in detail how they would work together and help each strategy to be successful
- used relevant and detailed examples from the scenario to best support their answers
- referred to relevant underlying concepts
- showed a good understanding of how a strategy would enhance hauora of both the students and others involved.

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

- explained the effectiveness of the strategies recommended – why and how the strategy would work, positives and negatives, and short-term and long-term benefits
- linked strategies clearly to an underlying concept other than hauora, such as Attitudes and Values or Health Promotion
- used evidence from the resource throughout their responses
- demonstrated how multiple strategies linked together can be better at enhancing hauora.

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

- identified strategies with no description or detail on how they could enhance hauora
- retold what was going on for Jamie, rather than describing strategies
- provided incorrect strategies or doubled up (for example, using two interpersonal strategies)
- submitted a very short or incomplete response.