

Nutrition Ed Material Critique 2

<https://www.cclhd.health.nsw.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/EatingWellBrochure.pdf>

5 points: Categorize the type of message: Where would one likely find/come across this nutrition message / ed material? Why do you categorize it that way?

I would expect to find this brochure in a magazine but it could easily be found on social media, but personally found it on google.

5 points: Message:

What is the message?

The message is targeted to older adults and their care takers. It talks about dietary changes that should be made when entering old age as well as some recommendations that are applicable to all ages of readers

IS THE INTENDED OBJECTIVE / MESSAGE CLEAR?

HOW COULD THIS BE IMPROVED UPON?

Who is the Author /Originator of this message?

The author of the message is the Public Health Nutrition team, Nutrition Services of Central Coast Local Health District, a public health service located in Australia

Who is the Publisher of this message?

Elsevier

Is the Author and/or producer of the material a credible, unbiased source?

The authors are credible. Upon reading their website their goal is to bring health to their community. They are similar to the local Geisinger, where they provide hospital services but also other public health services like nutrition education.

In what language(s) is this message?

English Language

5 points: Method/Mode of Communication:

HOW COULD THIS BE IMPROVED UPON?

What is the Date of Publication?

May of 2018

What is the Length of the "publication" (e.g., minutes, pages, etc.)

4 pages in length

Is the Mode of communication appropriate for the Content/Subject matter? For the Intended Audience?

Yes reading level and information are appropriate but it is too long.

5 points: Intended Audience:

Who is the intended Audience?

Older Adults and Their caregivers.

IS THE INTENDED AUDIENCE CLEAR?

Yes

HOW COULD THIS BE IMPROVED UPON?

10 points: How is the information is accurate, credible useful? How does the message support health and well-being? Is it Evidence-Based?

HOW COULD THIS BE ENHANCED OR IMPROVED?

Is this accurate, credible information: Information is based on up-to-date, and credible research.

I checked the website of the authors. I found no direct sources for the information listed but their website (<https://www.cclhd.health.nsw.gov.au/>) is a government website and

References and resources are accurate and up-to-date.

Material is free of sponsor/product bias.

No, the link leads us to the food blog "BidFood" that sells healthy foods and meal kits.

The content addresses the target/intended audience needs and concerns.

Yes, they directly address changes in dietary requirements and other suggestions for the elderly.

Examples are relevant to lifestyle of target audience.

Yes they are relevant especially the vitamin D portion. The malnutrition calculator is too strict, giving a “2” for uncertain is sure to give a fright to many geriatrics.

Messages clearly describe desired behavior changes and how to achieve them.

The message is too vague on things such as ice cream, sods, and does not specify whole grains. The author also directly lists “processed foods” which is never a healthy option and can increase BP and cholesterol.

General or abstract ideas are reinforced with specific, concrete examples.

Yes and no, most suggestions are worded similar to “increase your calcium” then the examples would be drink milk or eat cottage cheese. I say not because while they all have specific and concrete examples, their examples are not always specific or in some cases just misleading.

Recipe?

The source listed five recipes but did not describe ingredients or procedures it only gave a good sounding name leaving everything else for interpretation. This can lead to problems if they attempt to follow a listed recipe because the reader may not know the differences in oils and whole grains.

5 points: How is the information APPROPRIATE

Information presented contributes to appropriate conclusions and actions.

Yes

Information is appropriate to the age, gender, educational level, ethnicity, SES, lifestyle of the target/intended audience.

Yes

Free of cultural bias and stereotyping.

Yes

10 points: Is there any MIS-information? If so, what is it?

CORRECT ANY MIS-INFORMATION, using citations as appropriate.

The misinformation present comes from the author being too general or taking slight liberties.

Specific examples:

Page 1 – Author does not distinguish between whole and refined grains; does not differentiate between saturated, trans, or unsaturated fats and does not mention omega fatty acids; author states “and processed foods” which should not be included at all due to health deficits; states that the body requires a “dose of protein” and not to eat it through the day, while their “25-30” is in line with the recommendations stating that eating small amounts through the day does not work the same is false

Page 2 – Malnutrition screening tool is too rigorous; “Low fat diets are not appropriate for older frail people” should not be included as what is actually appropriate is determined on a case to case basis; author lists “three scoops of ice cream” but does not give a serving size in grams and leaves too much room for interpretation;

Page 3 – author lists “soft drink” as an acceptable beverage for hydration, not specifying that soft drinks and others listed should be drunk in moderation with water being the main consumed;

Page 4 – Shopping list has the same problems as the recommended food groups on page 1; recipes do not provide any information

10 points: In what ways can the message be damaging?

This can be damaging if the reader has a low education level in nutrition. Common people do not know the differences between whole and refined grains and similarly do not know the difference between cooking with something like lard versus cooking with olive oil. The text needs to be more specific in most places and should simply omit a few lines here and there. This material leaves the chance for a person to begin to follow an unhealthy habit of white breads and solid fats and may look at this resource as reinforcement to this behavior simply because the authors were not thorough.

25 points: Use the [SMOG Formula to Calculate the Readability](#).

Average of 10.69 on SMOG calculator

Clear purpose: title conveys content of material or attracts audience's attention. Introduction provides clear purpose of material. - **Yes**

Appropriate word usage: Words are familiar to target audience. Words are short, usually 2 syllables or less. New words are clearly defined. Two or fewer technical terms are used, with definitions provided. Vocabulary is consistent. - **Yes**

Appropriate sentence structure: Sentences are simple, short, specific, use active voice. Material is free of grammatical errors. - **Yes**

Appropriate paragraph structure: Paragraphs are limited to single message. Main ideas are clear and simply stated. Ideas flow smoothly and logically. - **Yes**

Appropriate overall organization: Appropriate number of concepts presented for length of piece. Priority is given to key information and recommendations. Headings identify different topics or concepts. Headings are simple and located close to text. Key ideas are highlighted, repeated, and summarized. Material is free of typographical errors. - **Yes**

Appropriate tone: Tone is personal, positive, and respectful. Uses personal pronouns and avoids gender bias. - **Yes**

Is the Resource Culturally-appropriate for the audience? If not, how could it be improved?

Yes

Is the message ACCURATE? CREDIBLE? TIMELY? If not, how could it be improved?

Yes

Are there CONTENT ERRORS? IS GRAMMAR, SPELLING, PUNCTUATION correct? Does writing and/or concepts FLOW? If not, how could it be improved?

No

DESIGN: Is the Design, color scheme, layout appropriate? Use of white space? Highlighting? Does it capture attention? Is it interactive, as appropriate?

Yes, easy to read and maintains attention without being overbearing

Appropriate use of color - to enhance appeal of material, draw attention to key areas; print can be easily read through background tints?

Yes, could use more color but this does not hinder anything

Readable type size and style? - **Yes**

Appropriate illustrations: Illustrations are simple and realistic. Located next to related items in the text. Serve to clarify, explain, or draw attention to main ideas in text. Provide a reasonable representation of a variety of people and families. Positive role models are depicted. Do illustrations / art support the message(s)? If not, how could it be improved? - **Yes**

Appropriate use of tables, charts, graphs: Clear and easy to read. Require no further calculations or background knowledge to be understood. Located next to related ideas in text. Use is appropriate to target audience. - **Yes except for malnutrition screen**

Organized, balanced layout: Uncluttered layout balances white space, words, and illustrations. Uses ragged right margins to aid readability. Line length is neither too short nor too long for type size.

Yes

15 points: Your final analysis (sum it up, what are your conclusions, recommendations, etc)

SMOG:

<https://www.textcompare.org/readability/smog-index/>

