

Assessment Report

On this page

[Level 3 Home Economics 2020](#) ▾

Level 3 Home Economics 2020

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

Part A: Commentary

Most candidates showed a good grounding in nutritional knowledge and were able to apply this to explain the impacts of ultra-processed foods (UPF) and advertising on societal well-being.

Part B: Report on standards

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

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- analysed the underlying intentions of each source, but with some inaccuracy

- made clear links between the conflicting information and the effects on societal well-being
- did not draw an appropriate, or detailed, conclusion regarding the credibility of the information provided to gain Merit.

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

- misunderstood the concept of conflicting information and were confused by the resources
- did not show evidence of impacts of UPF on societal well-being
- showed insufficient nutritional knowledge of UPF.

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

- showed sound understanding of UPF
- analysed the possible impacts on societal well-being of the conflicting information using their own knowledge, and information drawn from the resources
- used some tools (see standard specific comments below) to analyse the intentions and draw conclusions on the credibility of the resources.

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

- used evidence from the resources, as well as their own in-depth knowledge, to justify their conclusions
- used several tools (see subject specific comments below) to conclude decisively which sources were credible and which nutritional advice should be supported or challenged
- provided an in-depth analysis of the possible impacts of UPF on societal well-being.

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 is of little benefit as candidates must relate their answers to the resources provided. The importance of reading the resources carefully at the

beginning of the examination needs to be stressed. Do not make assumptions that the resource is conflicting.

To achieve a candidate could use the following points

- Look at credibility- is it believable, persuading based on motivation, source, reliability, evidence
- What is the intent, purpose, 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 nutrition knowledge of the conflicting topic and the use of this knowledge applied to the resources provided is of benefit for candidates to gain Merit and above.

Candidates using the following tools (red flags) for analysing conflicting nutritional information, typically gained higher grades

- The use of scare tactics
- Claims used 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 the range of techniques and were able to link techniques to the three advertisements, with most techniques correct
- clearly identified explicit features and explained how they indicated the use of the techniques chosen
- identified the target market for the advertisement
- explained the impacts on well-being either embedded within their analysis or in discrete dimensions.

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

- were unable to identify the target market for the advertisement
- did not use the techniques used in food advertising listed under point 4 of the Explanatory Notes of the Achievement Standard
- described the design of the advertisement (colours and font style) without explaining explicit features related to the techniques
- described explicit features without linking them to a technique
- did not address well-being in relation to the technique chosen.

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

- showed their understanding of the implicit messages of the features they had described
- explained the impacts on well-being either embedded within their analysis or in discrete dimensions.

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

- were strategic in planning their responses carefully to ensure their chosen techniques had several unique explicit features for which they were able to explain the underlying messages and then challenge those messages using critical thinking
- demonstrated sound nutrition knowledge when applicable and holistic understanding of the underlying concepts of well-being, attitudes and values

and the socio-ecological perspective.

Standard specific comments

- Principles of design such as colour and font that are not directly linked to the techniques are not relevant and seldom provide evidence in support of achievement.
- A challenge of the advertised product on the basis of nutritional value is commonly used. However, the challenge must be directed against the messages of the advertisement explained in part (b) and must be clearly linked to one or other of the techniques described in (a). For example – if the technique is ‘meal preparation is difficult and time consuming’ and the message is ‘our food box is the solution to your busy life, you will have more time to relax at night if you choose WOOP!’, the challenge must be ‘how much time does it really save/supermarkets will deliver/what if you can’t understand the recipe’, not ‘the meals won’t be healthy, the sauces/marinades will be full of sugar’.
- Using the same explicit features to explain both techniques limits candidates’ ability to show sufficient scope of analysis. For example - choosing the feature ‘no sugar’ for both ‘using nutrition information to gain credibility’ and ‘targeting specific groups’ or ‘lifestyle’ (those who are quitting sugar). Whereas, if the second technique chosen was ‘projecting an environmentally responsible image’ a wider range of explicit features and implicit messages can be explored.

[Home Economics subject page](#)

Previous years' reports

[2019 \(PDF, 258KB\)](#), [2018 \(PDF, 94KB\)](#), [2017 \(PDF, 43KB\)](#), [2016 \(PDF, 211KB\)](#)