

2022 NCEA Assessment Report



Mana Tohu Mātauranga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

Subject: Home Economics

Level: 3

Standards: 91470, 91471

Part A: Commentary

Candidates are encouraged to read through the entire question booklet before beginning to write their response. This will help them see the way the parts of the question have been scaffolded to guide them through the requirements of the standard, and they can then plan their response to best show their knowledge and avoid repetition.

The most effective responses considered the resource material, and then applied own learning to the question.

Candidate responses which reflected the underlying concepts generally achieved higher grades.

Part B: Report on standards

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

Examination

The examination comprised of one question separated into four parts (a)–(d). The resource material comprised of three articles.

The question covered the context specified in the 2022 assessment specification which was the role nutrition plays in gut health. The question required candidates to apply their own nutrition knowledge and understanding to analyse information in the resource material.

A critical evaluation of the credibility of the resource material was required, which involved using analysis tools, then challenging false assumptions in a clear and coherent essay-style answer.

Observations

Candidates who used the tools (red flags) were more successful in their analysis of the conflicting nutritional information.

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 consumers
- sensational statements and incomplete references and sources
- recommendations based on a single study

- personal attacks on reliable experts.

All resource material should be assumed by candidates to be read by people within the New Zealand society. Responses surrounding the idea that New Zealanders have difficulty accessing Australian publications are not an intended answer. It is useful to note that the Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) developed the Food Standards Code, which is used in both countries. Therefore, it is accepted that nutrition-based articles in publications such as the Australian Healthy Food Guide are relevant in New Zealand.

Grade awarding

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.

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

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

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

- showed sound understanding of digestive health
- 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 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 (red flags) 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 poor digestive health on societal well-being.

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

Examination

The examination comprised of one question separated into five parts (a)–(e). The resource material was comprised of three advertisements. The question covered the content specified in the 2022 assessment specifications, which was to explain a range of techniques to analyse advertisements provided. Two techniques were provided for

candidates in part (a), and candidates were required to explain two further techniques in part (c). A critical evaluation of one advertisement was required, which involved explaining the implicit messages conveyed by the explicit features such as slogans and images. Explaining the impact on well-being and then challenging the credibility of the messages in a concise essay answer was required.

Observations

The standard focuses on the influences of food advertising on well-being. It is not possible to meet the standard without describing impacts of food choices on well-being. Physical well-being was frequently mentioned without any nutritional knowledge being shown e.g. “The Moo Chews are healthy for kids and will improve their well-being” is insufficient evidence of understanding at Level 3. Very few candidates mentioned peak bone density or osteoporosis. Similar responses were given for Chantal Organics, such as “Physically they will be positively affected because they are getting fibre”, with no mention of what this means, e.g. satiety, and reduced constipation, or bowel disease. Similarly, social, mental, emotional and spiritual well-being were generally not mentioned, or not explored below surface level. If candidates consider ‘how’ or ‘why’ after each sentence they write, they would be more likely to improve their grade. For example, “The KFC gold bling appeals to emotions.” How? Descriptions or explanations are required to gain Achievement – Identifying points is not enough.

Part of success in this standard, is choosing the advertisement that the candidate is best able to analyse. One common error was candidates who believed the intended lifestyle targeted by MooChews was kids who live on a farm. Another common error was overlooking the “snack” aspect of Moo Chews and asserted that it was linked to high obesity rates in New Zealand. This may be evidence of rote-learned answers on the product rather than insightful application of knowledge.

Part (e), which focused on challenging the advertising appeared to have many non-specific rote-learned challenges about fast-food – especially for the KFC advertisement. Part (e) is intended to flow on from the analysis in parts (a)–(d), and candidates would do well to use this information to inform the challenge.

The challenges must be specific to the techniques used in the chosen advertisement.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed understanding of explicit features and accurately linked them to the appropriate technique
- described the correct target audience or described how the features appealed to people’s emotions
- described the impact on one or two dimensions of well-being.

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

- showed no understanding of the dimensions of well-being
- used colour as an explicit feature or identified an explicit feature simply as “image” or “bold font” with no description.

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

- explained the implicit messages conveyed by the explicit features
- explained the correct target audience and explained how the messages appealed to people's emotions
- explained how the messages influence food choices
- discussed well-being, explaining the impact on two or more dimensions.

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

- discussed several dimensions of well-being, making clear links between the techniques of the chosen advertisement and the impact of food choices on societal well-being
- applied their prior knowledge to analyse the resource material effectively, providing a challenge to the credibility of the messages which utilised evidence and examples from the resource material.