Assessment schedule: practice paper 2026

AS 91923 Demonstrate understanding of science-related claims in communicated information · Vertex Academy practice paper, not an NZQA paper

QUESTION ONE

Part	Evidence	Achievement (u)	Merit (r)	Excellence (t)
(a)	(i) NightOwl Optics, the company that sells the glasses (ii) to persuade people to buy them ($89, free shipping) (iii) wearing the glasses before bed helps you fall asleep faster	Describes the source (NightOwl Optics, the seller, on its own website), the purpose (to sell, as well as to inform) and a science-related claim (the glasses help you fall asleep faster, or block 99% of blue light).		
(b)	language: blue light, melatonin, sleep hormone, clinically tested conventions: trial of 20, averages with units (31 vs 37 minutes) bar graph axis starts at 28: bars 9 and 3 tall, three times as tall real change 6 minutes, 6 ÷ 37 ≈ 16%	Describes science language (melatonin, blue light, clinically tested) or conventions (trial, averages with units, bar graph).	Explains how each is used to support the claim: technical words and clinically tested make it sound scientific; numbers with units look precise; the cut-off axis makes a 6-minute (about 16%) change look three times as big.	
(c)	verdict: poorly supported only 20 people, no control group: placebo, routine or chance could explain 6 min seller ran its own trial on its own customers, not peer reviewed axis from 28 makes 16% look threefold; 99% blue light is not better sleep stronger: large trial, clear-lens control group, independent, peer reviewed			Evaluates how well the language and conventions support the claim, weighing several points with evidence: small sample, no control group, customers as participants, conflict of interest, no peer review, misleading axis; and says what would make the claim better supported.

QUESTION TWO

Part	Evidence	Achievement (u)	Merit (r)	Excellence (t)

(a)	(i) Southern University news website, about its own Sleep Lab's review (ii) to inform the public, and promote the university's research (iii) blue-light glasses make little or no difference to sleep	Describes the source (the university's news site, reporting its own researchers' review), the purpose (to inform, and promote the research) and the claim (the glasses make little or no difference to sleep).		
(b)	14 trials, 540 adults combined control group in identical clear lenses, nobody knew peer reviewed trials and review government funding, no conflicts; low certainty stated honestly	Describes the language (randomised controlled trials, control group, peer-reviewed, low certainty) or conventions (number of trials and people, control group, peer review, funding).	Explains how each supports the claim: many trials give more reliable evidence; an identical-looking control group rules out expectation; peer review means the methods were checked; declared funding and cautious wording make the source more trustworthy.	
(c)	verdict: well supported, with limits 14 trials, 540 adults, identical clear-lens control, nobody knew peer reviewed, public funding, no conflicts limit: low certainty, small short trials; a small effect not ruled out far better than A's 20 customers with no control, but not proof they never help			Evaluates how well the language and conventions support the claim: weighs the strengths (many controlled, blinded, peer-reviewed trials; no conflicts) against the admitted limits (low certainty, small and short trials), and judges the claim well supported but not proven, compared with Resource A.

Judgement

N0	N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
No response, or nothing relevant.	Little understanding of the claims is shown.	Some understanding, but a part is missing or several parts are weak.	Describes the source, purpose, claims and language or conventions, some parts thinly.	Securely describes the source, purpose, claims and language or conventions.	Explains how the language or conventions support the claims, some parts thinly.	Securely explains how the language or conventions support the claims.	Evaluates how well the language or conventions support the claims, some parts thinly.	Securely evaluates how well the language or conventions support the claims.

One grade for the whole response, N0 = 0 to E8 = 8: Not Achieved 0 to 2, Achieved 3 to 4, Merit 5 to 6, Excellence 7 to 8 (the 2025 exam's cut scores).