

2023 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Home Economics
Level:	Level 3
Achievement standard(s):	91470, 91471

General commentary

A common indicator of success was evidence of planning. Candidates who planned their response over all parts of the question were able to build and sustain their analysis or argument across the entire response.

There were fewer extremely long responses this year. However, some candidates are not utilising the resource material sufficiently, and are relying on pre-planned responses.

Candidate responses which reflected the underlying concepts with clear reference to the resources generally achieved higher grades.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

Assessment

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

The question covered the context specified in the 2023 assessment specification which was the role of fats and oils in a healthy diet. The question required candidates to apply their own nutritional knowledge of fats and oils, along with their understanding of their impacts on well-being, 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.

Commentary

Candidates who showed in-depth knowledge of fats and oils and their role in a healthy diet, and were able to apply their knowledge to analyse the resource material, achieved more highly than candidates whose responses were clearly pre-written.

Using the tools (red flags) helped candidates analyse the resource material, enabling them to show insight into the creditability of the material, and define and discuss the underlying intentions.

These included:

- 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
- criticism of reliable experts.

Some candidates stated that the articles would not be easily sourced by New Zealand society. This is not relevant as it is expected that the article has been read by New Zealand Society.

Candidates who were able to discuss impacts on well-being holistically, and in depth, achieved more highly than those who named the dimensions and wrote brief descriptions.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- analysed the underlying intentions of each source, although lacking total accuracy
- showed understanding of well-being, but did not discuss holistically
- lacked an appropriate or substantial conclusion
- lacked in-depth nutritional knowledge regarding the credibility of information.

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

- holistically discussed the possible impacts of conflicting information on societal well-being
- gave examples using their own sound understanding of fats and oils, and information drawn from the resources
- used tools to analyse the intentions and draw conclusions on the credibility of the resources.

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

- used several tools (red flags) to justify which sources were credible and which nutritional advice should be supported or refuted
- provided an in-depth analysis of the possible impacts of the information on societal well-being
- showed thorough understanding of nutrition guidelines and a range of fats and oils and their different properties.

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

- misunderstood the concept of conflicting information and were confused by the resources
- showed little understanding of the dimensions of well-being
- showed insufficient nutritional information of fats and oils.

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

Assessment

The examination comprised one question separated into five parts (a)–(e). The resource material comprised three advertisements.

The question covered the content specified in the 2023 assessment specification which was the analysis of one of three advertisements. The question required candidates to apply their nutritional knowledge and understanding to analyse information in the resource material.

A critical evaluation of one advertisement was required, which involved identifying explicit features, explaining implicit messages and their impact on well-being, then challenging the messages conveyed in a clear and coherent essay answer.

Commentary

The standard is focused on the influences of food advertising on well-being. Candidates who did not specifically discuss at least one dimension of well-being did not meet the standard. Mentioning that a product may be 'healthy' or 'nutritious' is not sufficient discussion on impacts on well-being.

Many candidates were able to describe explicit features and discuss their implicit messages with depth and accuracy, then were unable to relate these to any dimensions of well-being. Too many responses read like a Social Studies or Media Studies response, raising questions about the poor understanding shown of the underlying concepts of the HPE curriculum. This was further shown in the frequent use of the judgmental word 'lazy'. Many responses showed a lack of basic nutritional knowledge.

Naming the emotion will help candidates strengthen their response – for example, "excited to be helping the environment"; "relieved their child is eating vegetables in their bread".

Challenges must relate to the specific explicit features and implicit messages from the advertisement identified in part (b) of the question. Some candidates have used pre-prepared challenges of the techniques which did not show analysis of the chosen advertisement. At Level 3, challenges need to be expressed by reasoned argument, especially to the context of the advertisement selected.

A significant number of candidates in part (e) did not answer the question about challenging the messages, and instead explained how credible the messages were. It is important to distinguish between the food product itself (e.g. quinoa which can be part of a nutritious, balanced diet) and the messages relating to the advertising techniques (e.g. "an environmentally caring company") which can always be challenged.

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 **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- explained the implicit messages conveyed by the explicit features
- explained the correct target audience and 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.

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.