

# Assessment Report

---

## On this page

[Level 3 Home Economics 2019](#) ▼

[91470: Evaluate conflicting nutritional information relevant to well-being in NZ society](#) ▼

[91471: Analyse the influences of food advertising on well-being](#) ▼

## Level 3 Home Economics 2019

---

Standards [91470](#) [91471](#)

### Part A: Commentary

Most candidates showed a good grounding in nutritional knowledge, well-being and critical thinking and were able to apply these within their responses.

### Part B: Report on standards

## 91470: Evaluate conflicting nutritional information relevant to well-being in NZ

# society

---

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- provided enough evidence of analysis within each question
- used the format of the exam to analyse the possible impacts on the well-being of New Zealand society of the conflicting nutritional evidence, using material from the resources
- analysed the underlying intentions of each source, with some inaccuracy
- did not draw an appropriate, or substantial, conclusion regarding the credibility of the information to gain Merit.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- misunderstood the concept of Nutritionism and the effects on New Zealand society
- did not show evidence of the impacts of nutritionism, on holistic societal well-being
- showed insufficient nutritional understanding by their emphasis of one nutrient over a balanced diet.

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

- provided an analysis of the possible impacts on the well-being of New Zealand society of the conflicting nutritional evidence using their own knowledge, and information drawn from the resources
- used some tools (see subject specific comment below)
- showed sound understanding of the concept of Nutritionism
- analysed the intentions and motivations of each of the resources provided and accurately commented on their credibility by backing up their answer with information from the resource, or from their own knowledge.

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

- used the format of the exam in their favour and answered all the questions with a depth of understanding
- showed thorough understanding of the concept of Nutritionism

- used evidence from the conflicting resources to justify their stance, as well as their own nutritional knowledge
- provided an in-depth analysis of the possible impacts on well-being
- clearly analysed underlying intentions of each source throughout the paper
- used several tools (see standard specific comments below) to conclude decisively which sources were credible and which information should be supported or refuted.
- showed evidence of their own nutritional knowledge beyond the information provided in the resources and related this to assumptions or perceptions in the sources.

### **Standard specific comments**

Candidates who could confidently use statements such as “this is a red flag because” showed clear insight into the issue of credibility and could define and use the underlying intentions.

Pre-writing answers was of little benefit as the candidates needed to relate their responses to the resources provided.

To achieve with excellence, a candidate could have used the following points:

- look at credibility: is it believable, persuading based on motivation, source, reliability, evidence?
- what is the intent or purpose of the main idea?
- how does it compare to other sources of information for this topic, is it useful, is it convincing?
- does it raise more issues than it answers?
- does it engage rather than summarise, consider different angles, support with evidence, rather than emotion and instinct.

Accurate nutritional knowledge of the conflicting topic and the use of this knowledge applied to the resources provided was required for candidates to gain a Merit grade, or higher.

Candidates who used the tools (or red flags) to analyse the conflicting nutritional information generally gained higher grades. The tools included:

- use of scare tactics

- claims that are too good to be true
- promises of a quick fix
- statements about the products superiority
- the use of testimonials and anecdotes
- vague scientific terms used to confuse or imply
- sensational statements and incomplete references and sources
- recommendations based on a single study
- personal attacks on reliable experts

Some candidates stated that some resources may not be easily sourced within New Zealand, however, this is not the issue. The issue is that the candidate is faced with the article and it is expected that the article has been read by people within New Zealand society.

The age of the resources presented should be within five years old. Some candidates wasted writing time and space on this issue when it was not relevant in this examination.

Successful candidates were skilful in writing about holistic societal well-being, making links between the dimensions.

Candidates needed to challenge the different viewpoints provided by the resource by asking the why, how, when, where, what and who of the content and then support with evidence from the resources and their own knowledge.

---

## 91471: Analyse the influences of food advertising on well-being

---

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- understood and could correctly apply the range of techniques applicable to the three advertisements

- clearly indicated the features being analysed and discussed these in relation to the technique
- explained the intent of a feature and how that feature conveyed an explicit message
- used evidence in their analysis that was relevant and credible such as their own nutritional knowledge. There is an expectation that candidates do not just say a food is healthy, but can unpack this using their own nutritional knowledge
- ideally embedded well-being within their analysis rather than separating out the influences into the dimensions of well-being
- identified the target audience.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not use the techniques of the standard (see explanatory note 4) to influence food choice and well-being
- described rather than explained the features in the advertisement
- copied text from the advertisements without explaining its significance in influencing the intended audience
- lacked an awareness of the intended target audience and wrote from a personal perspective
- focused too much on the design of the advertisements (font style, colours and layout) and not the messages pertaining to food choice and well-being
- lacked an understanding of the intent of the advertisements
- used simplistic reasoning to explain the influence of the messages on the intended audience
- did not address well-being in relation to the technique chosen.

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

- understood the meaning behind the words and images
- showed they understood the intent of the messages and understood how implicit messages work to persuade or manipulate the audience to achieve the company's intended goal
- analysed the messages being conveyed with clarity

- explained how advertisements address the basic needs / emotions of the intended audience
- explained how the intended audience might respond to the message as well as any beliefs attitudes, perceptions and assumptions about the product / company that could be held
- used evidence in their analysis that was relevant and credible such as their own nutritional knowledge or their own knowledge of human behaviour.
- embedded well-being within their analysis rather than separating it out into the dimensions of well-being / hauora.

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

- followed through the explicit and implicit messages in the advertisement and used reasoned argument to challenge the messages conveyed, for example; assumptions made, stereotypes portrayed, credibility of information provided, and motivations of the companies.
- showed they understood subliminal messages
- showed a holistic view of well-being / hauora
- demonstrated sound nutritional knowledge when applicable
- wrote a fluent and articulate argument.

### **Standard specific comments**

Courses at level three Home Economics must use the techniques in the standard (see explanatory note 4) for guidance. Candidates must only use these techniques in the examination, colour and branding can be used to support these techniques but are not the techniques accepted in this standard.

The technique of 'Emotion' can be linked to any advertisement, and generally is used once only as a supporting technique to show a thorough understanding of the standard. However, this year in the McDonald's advertisement, 'appealing to people's emotions' was appropriately used as either the main or supporting technique.

Well-being / hauora, at level 3, is expected to be written about in a holistic sense rather than breaking it down into the 4 dimensions. However, candidates who did this were not penalised, and many candidates showed good understanding of the effects of the advertising messages on well-being / hauora.

Candidates who performed well presented reasoned arguments that clearly established links between the techniques, the features and the explicit and implicit messages and then followed through to challenge these messages appropriately.

## [Home Economics subject page](#)

### **Previous years' reports**

[2018 \(PDF, 94KB\)](#),

[2017 \(PDF, 43KB\)](#),

[2016 \(PDF, 211KB\)](#).