

Level 3 Home Economics 2018

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

Part A: Commentary

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:

- used the format of the exam to complete an analysis of the possible impacts on the well-being of New Zealand society of the conflicting nutritional evidence from the resources
- analysed the underlying intentions of each source, although the analysis may not be totally accurate
- did not draw an appropriate or substantial conclusion regarding the credibility of any information provided in each resource.

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

- misunderstood the impact of the nutritional information on fats for healthy hearts in relation to personal and societal well-being
- analysed insufficient nutritional information
- presented little knowledge of fat for healthy hearts, with little reference to the resources provided
- were inaccurate in identifying intentions of the resources.

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

- provided an analysis of the possible impacts on the well-being of the New Zealand society of the conflicting nutritional evidence from the resources
- showed obvious knowledge regarding fats for healthy hearts
- answered all the questions following the format of the examination.

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

- used the format of the examination to answer all the questions
- showed a thorough understanding, and consistent evidence of the conflicting resources
- clearly analysed the possible impacts on well-being and the underlying intentions of each source in-depth
- used several tools to conclude decisively which sources are credible and which information should be supported or refuted
- use nutritional knowledge on top of what was given in the articles for at least two 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-preparing answers is of little benefit as the candidates must relate their answers to the resources provided.

Candidates should use the following points:

- Look at credibility. Is it believable? Persuasion based on motivation, source, reliability, evidence.
- What is the intent and purpose of the main idea?
- How does it compare, is it useful, is it convincing?
- Does it raise more issues than answers?
- Does it engage rather than summarise?
- Consider different angles, support with evidence rather than emotion and instinct.

Accurate nutritional knowledge of the topic, and application to the resources provided is required to gain Merit and above.

Useful tools (red flags) when analysing conflicting nutritional information include:

- the use of scare tactics
- claims that are too good to be true
- promises of a quick fix
- statements about the product’s 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.

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
- embedded well-being within their analysis rather than separating out the influences into the dimensions of well-being
- related well-being to the technique being discussed.
- 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 wellbeing
- described, rather than explained, why the features conveyed explicit messages 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 use 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 holistic view of well-being
- demonstrated sound nutritional knowledge when applicable
- wrote a fluent and articulate argument.

Standard specific comments

This was the first year the paper required candidates to write in depth about one advertisement rather than three, however in part (a) candidates were asked to describe the main and supporting techniques used in each advertisement. This showed the marker that the candidate understood and could correctly apply the range of techniques applicable to the three advertisements.

Section (a) requires candidates to 'describe', this means candidates were expected to write down the relevant technique and a brief description of why they believed this was the relevant technique.

In section (b) again the word 'describe' is used. This signals to the candidate that a description rather than an explanation of the features used in the advertisement is required. Many candidates spent too much time writing in depth in (a) and then repeated the same material in (b) which was not necessary. Bullet point format was acceptable in section (b).

Courses at level three Home Economics must use the techniques in the standard (see Explanatory Note 4) for guidance.

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 Karma Cola 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

[2017](#), [2016](#)