

Assessment Schedule – 2017

Home Economics: Evaluate conflicting nutritional information relevant to well-being in New Zealand society (91470)

Assessment Criteria

Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
<p><u>Evaluate</u> involves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • analysing the conflicting nutritional information • drawing conclusions that relate the nutritional information to well-being. 	<p><u>Evaluate, in depth</u>, involves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • analysing the underlying intent of the conflicting nutritional information • drawing conclusions about the credibility of the nutritional information sources. 	<p><u>Evaluate comprehensively</u> involves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • critically analysing the conflicting nutritional information • drawing justified conclusions about the credibility of the nutritional information.

Evidence

N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
Little evidence of discrimination between valid / invalid information.	Demonstrates some understanding, but does not analyse (no nutritional knowledge of their own provided).	Analyses enough information / evidence to draw an appropriate conclusion relating to well-being (some nutritional knowledge of their own provided).	Analyses most of the information to draw an appropriate conclusion relating to well-being.	Analyses and evaluates, in depth, some intentions / motivation of the information presented. Draws a conclusion regarding the credibility of the information (at least one tool is used).	Analyses and evaluates, in depth, a broad range of intentions / motivations of the information presented. Draws conclusions regarding the credibility of all of the information (several tools are used).	Justifies their position about the dietary advice and challenges at least ONE inherent assumption.	Fully justifies their position about the dietary advice and challenges at least TWO inherent assumptions.

See **Appendix** for sample evidence.

N0 = No response; no relevant evidence.

Cut Scores

Not Achieved	Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
0 – 2	3 – 4	5 – 6	7 – 8

Appendix – Sample evidence

Question	Expected Coverage (examples)
(a)	<p><u>Possible impacts on the well-being of New Zealand society, of the conflicting nutritional information presented in the resources:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource A: <i>New Scientist Magazine</i>, e.g.: <i>This is an article written to stimulate interest and to correct many people’s current thinking about the term “superfoods”. If you are currently using superfoods, it may make you think about your reasons for doing so, or encourage you to do more research about what superfoods are. The general public in New Zealand would not be reading this magazine unless they visited a library, so they would not usually see this information, but if they did, it would challenge their own thinking. Well-being could be affected positively due to the information in the text that informs the reader that superfoods are no miracle foods and that the use of them is not necessary when a balanced diet is followed as per the MOH guidelines.</i> • Resource B: <i>The Skinny Chef Website</i>, e.g.: <i>Looking at the website, the words “health”, “healthy”, and “gluten free” appear and this draws the reader into the site and the many highlighted hyperlinks. The site also has a competition on the right-hand side that encourages you to stay on the site longer and give your own personal details away, so that you can be contacted in the future. The information could negatively affect New Zealanders well-being as the site is promoting foods that are unnecessary and a big extra expense when a balanced diet is followed.</i> • Resource C: <i>The Dominion Post Newspaper</i>, e.g.: <i>This is a New Zealand interpretation of the New Scientist Magazine article, so it is extremely relevant to New Zealanders and would be widely read. The price comparison uses foods purchased on the online store of Countdown, a supermarket chain in New Zealand. If anyone reads this article, they too will be doubting the superfood fad, as the article clearly states that there is no real benefit from eating these foods and that one of the drivers for superfoods is the recipe books that are being produced now. The affects on well-being could be positive, as the article shows other everyday food options that are cheaper than the advertised superfoods, appealing to those on lower incomes that feel they may be missing out on health benefits.</i> • Resource D: <i>Power Super Foods Website</i>, e.g.: <i>This website is selling no real foods, but powders and supplements that provide “an array of antioxidants, vitamins, and fibres”. There is no “real” food from this site, but powders that can be added to your own foods or eaten by themselves, to gain the benefits of “superfoods”. If anyone was to buy these foods, they would be using money that could be used for fresh fruit and vegetables, or the actual foods that are not sold in powder form, e.g. Gogi berries. Adding the word “organic” adds extra cost to the foods, as it is a trendy title. Well-being is affected by the cost of these supplement foods that many may find necessary to gain a balanced diet, when in fact many of the valuable nutrients may have been destroyed in the processing.</i>

(b)

Underlying intentions of the different information relating to superfoods presented in the resources, drawing conclusions about the credibility of the information, and of those presenting it:

- Resource A: *New Scientist Magazine*, e.g.:

This is an article from New Scientist, a UK-based magazine that is published weekly and stimulates readers with up-to-date scientific information. They are not advising the use of superfoods, but are asking people to consider what they use them for, and stating that the term “superfoods” does not mean anything at all. They are unbiased and credible since they are not selling any superfoods, or promoting the use of them.

- Resource B: *The Skinny Chef Website*, e.g.:

The website title says it all – “The Skinny Chef” – and how many skinny chefs do we see and do we trust them? This website is American. It introduces the term “superfoods” on one of its pages, but the website has many links that are available for you to go and look at, and in the process of doing so, hooks you into the site to read more information and eventually get you to sign up to the many “healthy” services that are available. If a person has health issues and is searching the Internet for a cure, then this site would be attractive, and allow you to purchase superfoods that will help heal you, judging by the messages given on the site from someone who shows their qualifications as a healthy cooking expert, health coach, and TV host. This is not a credible site, and the intention is to sell products. The creditability of “The Skinny Chef” is in doubt as it is stated she is a healthy cooking expert, health coach, and TV host, but no information is available about her qualifications to support these titles. The site offers an invitation to join up and then purchase information and recipes.

- Resource C: *The Dominion Post Newspaper*, e.g.:

This is a credible New Zealand newspaper article written by journalist Rachel Thomas, who has found the New Scientist Magazine article, and has rewritten the article into a New Zealand context. She is not selling anything, but informing the New Zealand public about the costs of superfoods in a New Zealand context. This is not a conflicting resource, but an information source for anyone to take information from, and use for their own well-being and information. The Auckland dietician, Carol Wham, who is quoted, often writes for the Healthy Food Guide and is a credible source of information that is unbiased.

- Resource D: *Power Super Foods Website*, e.g.:

This website would come up if you did a search online for superfoods and would instantly be of interest, as it is selling superfoods in a convenient form, with discounts for freight orders, so that you can buy more superfoods to get “better value for money”. The site is attractive and has an old-style, traditional look, which is what people are looking for because in reality superfoods have been around for many years. The foods sold have been processed and would have most likely been stripped of their “super” powers. You would still have to buy food to eat, as these supplements are not actual food, so it would be a huge extra cost to you. The site would also draw you into purchasing other goods and services that they offer, giving you a very biased view of superfoods. The company wants your money, and is piggybacking on the term “superfoods” to make their money.

(c)

Various positions taken in the resources, in relation to superfoods and well-being in New Zealand, with a conclusion drawn using reasoned arguments from the candidate's own nutritional knowledge and understanding:

The term “superfoods” has been in New Zealand for the past five years or so. With each food that has been given the “superfood” label, it comes with a deliciously tantalising promise that the foods will transform, reduce weight, improve brain function, be a miracle cure, etc, all to give benefits and enhance our lives. Superfoods can come in the form of real food or supplements, but the term is trendy and has many people purchasing these foods at great expense, with often little health benefit. Here lie the conflicting messages. There is no doubt that some “superfoods” can facilitate and enhance many of our bodily functions, however many people are becoming reliant on media coverage, with little or no nutritional knowledge themselves, and are purchasing these foods as a “one-stop shop” to improve health and well-being. The best thing would be to drop the term altogether, as it is confusing for a public not often educated in nutrition.

Resources A and C take the same stance: Resource A is the original UK article, and Resource C is a New Zealand interpretation of it. They are not selling you anything, but are raising awareness about the term superfoods, and the media hype behind it. Resources B and D are both selling products and are making money from the term “superfoods”, and tempting the vulnerable with their goods and services.

Whilst two of the articles provided by the media do appear to be giving us reliable information, this is often not the case. The media frequently report sensationalist news about the latest food fad, and this makes the average consumer confused about what they should be eating. The media also misreport findings from scientific reports, i.e. they cherry pick out the information that makes for a good story.

The food industry want to increase their market share, and are always looking for ways to introduce new flavours to existing products, in order to make money, e.g. adding blueberries or Acai berries to a muesli bar and charging more for it.

Superfoods are not backed by science; the term superfoods has been recently coined / created by the food industry advertising departments to set apart one food from the plethora of other foods. Much of the ‘scientific’ research on the latest superfood may not be backed by good scientific studies. Just because someone has published their work in an obscure journal, or wears a white coat, doesn't mean that their findings are better than the existing advice given by the Ministry of Health.

Overall, a balanced diet with a range of nutrients particularly from grains, fruits, and vegetables (where superfoods are derived), is the recommendation. Supplements are a big extra on our budgets and need to be considered with a good knowledge base, and perhaps some advice from health professionals. Following the New Zealand Food and Nutrition Guidelines, which recommend 6 servings a day of bread and cereals, 5+ servings a day of fruit and vegetables, and no highly processed foods, should meet the requirements for our bodies to function well every day.