

2024 NCEA Assessment Report

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

General commentary

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

Candidate responses that 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 assessment had one question separated into four parts (a) to (d). The resource material contained three articles.

The question covered the context specified in the 2024 assessment specifications, which was sports nutrition. The question required candidates to apply their own nutritional knowledge, along with their understanding of its 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 answer.

Commentary

Candidates generally demonstrated a clear understanding of the conflicting messages in the resource material. Most candidates answered all parts of the question, which is highly recommended as evidence for achievement.

Candidates are expected to use their own nutritional knowledge and understanding of sports nutrition. It is also important to apply holistic well-being to every resource, not just physical. When a candidate showed thorough understanding of conflicting messages in the resources, applied their nutrition knowledge, and challenged the messages, they were able to gain higher grades.

Not all candidates analysed the layers of conflicting messages in Resource A. All candidates identified Resource B as containing the most conflicting information, but few chose to expand on the ultra-processed food that was produced by this company and the dangers of such foods for New Zealanders' well-being.

Most candidates identified Resource C as the least conflicting and recognised that it provided useful information for parents and New Zealanders, but still many chose Resource A as their preferred option due to all the material that was presented. Candidates showed their understanding of the differences between a dietician and a nutritionist, which is often how they made their final decision.

Candidates using the “red flags” to help identify conflicting messages, making reference to these as a base to their discussions generally achieved higher grades.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- analysed the underlying intentions of each source, although lacked total accuracy
- showed understanding of well-being, but did not discuss this 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 sports nutrition, as well as 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 in relation to sports nutrition.

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 understanding or evidence of sports nutrition.

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

Assessment

The assessment had one question separated into five parts (a) to (e). The resource material contained three advertisements.

The question covered the content specified in the 2024 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 response.

Commentary

Candidates generally demonstrated a clear understanding of the techniques used in the three advertisements. The Red Bull and granola advertisements were most commonly chosen by candidates. Most candidates answered all five parts of the question, which is highly recommended as evidence for achievement can be taken from part (e). Some candidates structured their responses into paragraphs with a clear organisation of their ideas.

Candidates are expected to use their own nutritional knowledge and understanding. It is insufficient to only use the explicit messages for physical well-being (e.g. “The granola is good for physical well-being because it has resistant starch fibre, so it is healthy” shows no prior knowledge). The explicit messages need to be interpreted and explained – what are the effects of a fibre-rich breakfast? (e.g. “The resistant starch fibre in the granola makes it a satisfying breakfast that fills you up and helps reduce the risk of constipation”).

Candidates who performed well in part (c) were able to name at least one emotion (e.g. “Stating it is carbon neutral makes people feel relieved OR excited OR happy that they are able to choose a granola that fits their belief in environmental care”, rather than simply stating “The granola appeals to their emotions by stating it is carbon neutral”).

Those who did not perform well in part (e) did not challenge the messages they explained in part (b), instead challenging something not related to the techniques, such as the cost of the product. The assessment is one question, broken into five parts, so the response should show connections and build between parts (b), (c), (d), and (e). Candidates need to be more strategic in part (b) to ensure the implicit messages they explain there are able to be challenged in part (e).

The impact of the food choice on societal well-being must be linked to a robust challenge of the implicit messages. Quoting New Zealand obesity statistics is not sufficient unless it has been prefaced by an appropriate challenge to the technique.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- described explicit messages and accurately associated them with the appropriate technique
- described the correct target audience OR described how the explicit messages appealed to people’s emotions
- showed understanding of the impact of the explicit messages on one or more dimension(s) of well-being.

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

- explained the implicit messages conveyed by one or two of the techniques
- explained the correct target audience AND explained how the explicit messages appealed to people’s emotions
- explained how the implicit messages influence food choices
- explained the impact of the implicit messages on two or more dimensions of well-being.

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

- challenged the implicit messages with reasoned arguments, using their own nutritional knowledge and understanding
- discussed the influence food advertising has on food choices, and the impact of these choices on societal well-being.

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

- identified explicit messages as “image”, “colour”, or “large font” with no description
- identified one or more of the dimensions of well-being with no understanding shown.