

2025 NCEA Assessment Report

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

General commentary

Candidates who planned their response for all parts of the questions 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.

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.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

Assessment

The assessment comprised one question separated into four parts. The resource material comprised three articles.

The question covered the context specified in the 2025 assessment specification – the role of red meat in a balanced diet. The question required candidates to apply their own nutritional knowledge, along with their understanding of their impacts on well-being, to analyse information in the resource booklet.

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 the components of a balanced diet and were able to apply their knowledge to analyse the resource material achieved more highly than candidates whose responses were clearly pre-prepared.

Using the tools (red flags) helped candidates analyse the resource material, enabling them to show insight into the credibility 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.

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:

- provided enough evidence for Achievement with a good overview of the resources used
- analysed the possible impacts of the well-being of New Zealand society of the conflicting nutritional evidence from the resources
- analysed the intention of each article, although the analysis may not have been totally accurate
- showed understanding of the dimensions of well-being.

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

- analysed the possible impacts on the well-being of the New Zealand society of the conflicting nutritional evidence from resources
- showed obvious knowledge regarding red meat consumption and the effects of today's diet choices
- demonstrated understanding of holistic well-being as well as sound nutrition knowledge; even though it may have been copied from the resources, it was correctly applied.

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

- showed a thorough understanding and consistent use of evidence from the conflicting resources
- used in-depth analysis of the possible impacts on holistic well-being and thoroughly understood the underlying intentions of each article
- capably used several tools to conclude decisively which sources were credible and which information should be supported or refuted
- confidently demonstrated and applied knowledge from their classroom studies.

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

- misunderstood the concept of conflicting information and were confused by the resources
- demonstrated little knowledge of well-being
- showed insufficient knowledge regarding red meat consumption and the effects of today's diet choices.

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

Assessment

The assessment comprised one question separated into five parts. The resource material comprised three advertisements.

The question covered the content specified in the 2025 assessment specification –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
- discussing implicit messages and their impact on well-being
- then challenging the messages conveyed in a clear and coherent essay-style answer.

Commentary

The Meadow Fresh Quick Brekkie was the most chosen advertisement by candidates. Most candidates answered all five parts of the assessment, 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.

Careful reading of the questions is needed to ensure candidates answer the question. The advertising techniques for each advertisement are provided, and it is those techniques candidates are expected to analyse. While it may be appropriate to introduce a third technique in parts (c) and / or (d), it is not recommended to use techniques not listed in the table for the whole response.

Understanding of descriptors can be improved. The descriptors scaffold responses from 'describe' to 'explain' and 'analyse' through to higher order thinking 'discuss' and 'challenge'. Candidates are writing too much at the 'describe' stage and not enough at the 'discuss' stage.

Candidates who performed well in part (c) were able to name the emotions evoked by the messages (e.g. "stating it is a quick brekkie makes people feel relieved OR excited OR happy they are able to find a breakfast option that fits their busy, time-poor life" rather than simply stating "the drink appeals to their emotions by stating it is a quick brekkie").

Part (d) showed a lack of understanding of well-being, which limited candidates' level of achievement, despite some candidates providing discussion of implicit messages. There are four dimensions of well-being, and the question asks for analysis, which tells candidates that merely identifying well-being will be insufficient. "The nutrients will help your body function" is insufficient as it shows no nutritional knowledge or understanding of well-being.

Those who did not perform well in part (e) did not challenge the implicit 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 with 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 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 a challenge to the technique.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

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

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

- explained the implicit messages conveyed by one or both techniques, and analysed how they influence food choice
- explained the correct target audience and explained how the messages appealed to people's emotions
- 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 choice, and the impact on societal well-being.

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

- identified explicit features as "bold text", "bright colour"
- showed no understanding of the four dimensions of well-being or identified them with insufficient depth.