

Assessment Schedule – 2025

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><i>Evaluating conflicting nutritional information relevant to well-being in New Zealand society involves:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analysing the conflicting nutritional information drawing conclusions that relate the nutritional information to well-being. 	<p><i>Evaluating, in depth, conflicting nutritional information relevant to well-being in New Zealand society involves:</i></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 source. 	<p><i>Evaluating comprehensively conflicting nutritional information relevant to well-being in New Zealand society involves:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> critically analysing the conflicting nutritional information drawing justified conclusions about the credibility of the nutritional information.

N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
Attempts to analyse the information but shows little evidence of relevant information.	<p>Demonstrates some understanding by analysing ONE piece of information.</p> <p>No nutritional knowledge of their own provided.</p>	<p>Analyses TWO pieces of information provided and draws a conclusion relating to well-being in New Zealand society.</p> <p>Some nutritional knowledge of their own provided.</p>	<p>Analyses most of the information provided to draw a conclusion relating to well-being in New Zealand society.</p> <p>Some nutritional information of their own provided.</p>	<p>Explains the credibility, intent, and impacts on well-being in New Zealand society, across all of the information presented.</p> <p>Draws on their own nutritional knowledge and shows the underlying impact on societal well-being with some reference to the sources.</p>	<p>Explains, in depth, the credibility, intent, and impacts on well-being in New Zealand society, across all of the information presented.</p> <p>Draws on their own nutritional knowledge and shows the underlying impact on societal well-being with some reference to the sources.</p>	<p>Justifies a position about the dietary advice and well-being in New Zealand society, and challenges at least ONE message.</p> <p>Draws on their own nutritional knowledge and clearly shows the underlying impact on societal well-being, with reference to the sources.</p>	<p>Justifies a position about the dietary advice and well-being in New Zealand society, and challenges at least TWO messages.</p> <p>Draws on their own nutritional knowledge and clearly shows the underlying impact on societal well-being, with reference to the sources.</p>

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

Evidence

Answers must refer to New Zealand society.

Part	Sample Evidence
(a)(i)	<p><i>Credibility of the information and source:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is written by <i>Beef + Lamb New Zealand</i>, which means it is relevant to New Zealanders. However, it does not specify <i>who</i> wrote this article or what their qualifications may be. • It makes reference to the World Cancer Research Fund, as well as the Ministry of Health – a government agency so likely to be a credible source of information. • It has a link to download a report that the recommendation they are making comes from – this shows a reference from credible sources. • However, it is from <i>Beef + Lamb New Zealand</i>, which is an organisation that promotes New Zealand meat, and ultimately wants consumers to buy it. Because they are promoting specific food products, this is a 'red flag' in terms of credibility. • There are no other references offered to support credibility. However, there is a statement that recommends people seek professional advice from a Registered Dietitian or Registered Nutritionist if eating plant-based diets. • It seems to be balanced as it does discuss other sources of iron, and states that "a meatless diet can be nutritionally adequate". • The information included overall seems to be sensible and mostly credible nutrition information.
(a)(ii)	<p><i>Underlying intentions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This information is designed to inform people about the amounts and benefits of eating red meat as part of a balanced diet. • Because of the source of the information, the intention is that people will buy and eat red meat.
(a)(iii)	<p><i>Possible impacts:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If people in New Zealand follow this information, they will benefit physically, as it will help them to provide essential nutrients (particularly high-quality protein, iron, zinc, and vitamin B12) needed for a balanced diet. • This can have a positive impact on New Zealand society, as more people may be keeping physically well, which can reduce healthcare-related costs. • They will feel good about their food choices and confident that the choice they are making to include red meat in their diets is recommended by the World Cancer Research Fund and the Ministry of Health. • People may misinterpret this information and feel concerned if they are choosing a plant-based diet. • People may misinterpret this information and think that because it's recommending red meat consumption, if they eat <i>more</i> than recommended, it may be even better for them – and this can lead to negative physical impacts, as well as potentially being very expensive and causing stress.
(b)(i)	<p><i>Credibility of the information and source:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Heart Foundation</i> is a well-known New Zealand organisation. It is recognised as a credible source of information, as it is primarily concerned with educating people to reduce their risks of heart disease. • It is written by a qualified Registered Dietitian and states her qualifications – this means the author is credible. • It provides balanced information about eating red meat and not eating red meat. • It is not trying to sell anything or get readers to eat anything specific. • There are references provided. • There are no obvious 'red flags' in this information.
(b)(ii)	<p><i>Underlying intentions:</i></p> <p>This information is designed to inform and educate the readers to support people to reduce their risk of developing heart disease.</p>

(b)(iii)	<p><i>Possible impacts:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If people follow this advice, they will potentially reduce their risk of developing heart disease or stroke, due to not eating red meat in large quantities. • People following this advice are likely to feel good about themselves and confident in the decisions they are making about their diet knowing it is advice from the <i>Heart Foundation</i> – a reputable source. • If more people in New Zealand were to follow this advice in their diets, the number of people developing heart disease and stroke would decrease, reducing the burden on our health system.
(c)(i)	<p><i>Credibility of the information and source:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an advertisement found online promoting <i>Pams'</i> plant-based meat alternatives. • Because this is clearly an advertisement, the information it contains is not very credible. • They have made reference to some very credible sources – the Ministry of Health, Heart Foundation, and Harvard Medical School – to support their statements about making the switch to plant-based foods, which makes this seem somewhat credible.
(c)(ii)	<p><i>Underlying intentions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By using the hyperlinks to the credible sources, it helps to 'muddy the waters' and make it sound like they are trying to educate people and provide a solution to support their health. • This advertisement is designed to encourage people who have heard all the latest advice about reducing meat intake and increasing plant-based foods to purchase these products – especially targeting those people who do enjoy their meat and are reluctant to eat traditional meat alternatives, such as beans and legumes.
(c)(iii)	<p><i>Possible impacts:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People who choose to consume these sorts of products are likely to see some positive health benefits by reducing their red meat intake – it may help lower their risk of heart disease and stroke. • They are likely to feel good about themselves for choosing these products, as they know it has health benefits, and they are trying to look after themselves. • For some people, purchasing these products may cause some financial stress, as they are often more expensive than other more traditional meat alternatives, such as beans and legumes. • These products are ultra-processed and, as such, carry potential health disadvantages. When looking at the ingredients list, you can see there are a number of ingredients that contain various types of fat as well as salt and sugar. Current advice recommends limiting the intake of ultra-processed foods too. • If more New Zealanders choose to buy and consume this type of ultra-processed food, this could potentially lead to an increase in other diet-related issues linked to ultra-processed food consumption, which could increase the burden on our health system.
(d)	<p><i>More credible and why:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource B is the most credible of the three resources. • Resource B is not trying to sell anything – it is from a well-known and credible New Zealand organisation that is primarily concerned with reducing the incidence of heart disease in our country. • Resource B is not endorsed or sponsored by any food manufacturers. • Resource B is written by a Registered Dietitian and has clear references for the information it contains. • Resource A seems to be reasonably credible but needs to be considered critically. It is written by <i>Beef + Lamb New Zealand</i>. While this resource itself is not trying to sell anything, it is trying to encourage people to keep red meat (beef and lamb in particular) as part of their diets. • Resource A does provide a balanced discussion and acknowledges that eating more plant-based products is a good dietary decision and references the World Cancer Research Fund, as well as the Ministry of Health, but it does slightly inflate the recommendations of meat intake per week. • Resource B states "eating less than 350 g of unprocessed red meat a week", whereas Resource A states "eating up to 350–500 g of cooked red meat per week". • The <i>New Zealand Eating and Activity Guidelines</i> recommend eating portions of 100 g cooked meat a day but also recommend a variety of foods to be consumed from this food group (legumes, nuts, seeds, fish and other seafood, eggs, and poultry and / or red meat with the fat removed) indicating that not all servings gained from this food group should be exclusively red meat.

- Consuming high quantities of red meat can negatively impact physical well-being by increasing saturated fat intake, which is linked to weight gain and increasing cholesterol levels.
- Resource C provides some credible information and makes links to credible sources, such as the Ministry of Health, *Heart Foundation*, and Harvard Medical School. However, the major red flag here is that its overriding intention is to convince people to buy their products.
- Resource C is promoting plant-based meat alternative products, but these are ultra-processed foods – current nutrition advice focuses on eating ‘real’ food and avoiding processed food.
- These sorts of ultra-processed foods often contain higher-than-recommended amounts of salt (which can contribute to stroke and high blood pressure), sugars (which contribute to diabetes and obesity), and saturated fats (which contribute to heart disease).
- If more New Zealanders are convinced by information such as that in Resource C, this may result in negative impacts on physical well-being in terms of weight gain, obesity, and heart disease from excess sugar, saturated fat, and salt consumption. This can then negatively impact other aspects of well-being and New Zealand society, as the costs relating to healthcare increase.
- If more New Zealanders follow the information found in Resource B, they will most likely benefit physically by reducing their red meat intake, eating a wider variety of nutritious foods, and obtaining the nutrients needed to enhance their well-being and reduce their risk of developing diet-related illnesses. This benefits New Zealand society by keeping a productive workforce and reducing costs to the health system and taxpayer.