

Assessment Report

Level 1 Media Studies 2017

Standards [90991](#) [90992](#)

Part A: Commentary

Candidates who succeeded could respond to the statements in the question using media language and concepts in relation to the standard's requirements.

Candidates who responded outside of a Media Studies framework did not succeed.

Candidates who did not address the question did not succeed.

Candidates who were well prepared to answer a question did well.

Many answers were limited regurgitation of rote learned essays that did not allow candidates to show comprehensive or in-depth understanding or respond to specific questions.

Some candidates seemed ill-prepared for the requirements of these exams.

Part B: Report on standards

90991: Demonstrate understanding of the media coverage of a current issue or event

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified and described a story in the past 12 months
- described one aspect of the coverage
- identified two specific pieces of evidence and related them to the way the media covered the story.
- attempted to explain reasons for coverage, but did so superficially or incorrectly.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- failed to adequately describe the coverage of a story
- gave little or no supporting evidence
- drew erroneous or superficial conclusions that failed to support other material/evidence supplied
- wrote too little/irrelevant discussion.

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

- used specific evidence and considered how the evidence demonstrated the way news is covered.
- drew valid conclusions as to the impact of the coverage
- directly addressed the chosen topic and supported with relevant evidence from news organisations and commentators
- explained why news stories are covered in this way.

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

- clearly identified the story, its coverage and the reasons why the story was covered this way
- went beyond the evidence and considered wider implications of the coverage
- displayed comprehensive understanding of broader news/political/social/economic values behind the story
- displayed sound structure in their discussion
- drew insightful and broader/deeper conclusions in relation to the coverage of their chosen story.

Standard specific comments

Many schools selected appropriate stories that allowed candidates to explore broader issues, in depth. However, a number of schools chose stories that failed to generate deeper discussion.

90992: Demonstrate understanding of characteristics of a media genre

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed simple understanding of the nature of the genre
- were able to describe two significant characteristics of their chosen genre
- were able to supply examples of characteristics of sufficient detail from two texts
- structured and paragraphed their responses
- attempted to explore impact/effect, but in insufficient detail
- referred to the question chosen, if somewhat briefly.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- failed to provide examples from two texts.
- failed to introduce the genre and show any understanding of the genre
- only discussed one characteristic
- chose characteristics/genres irrelevant to media studies
- discussed text rather than genre.

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

- showed sound understanding of their chosen genre
- gave reasoned explanation of how and why the characteristics are used in the genre
- provided detailed and relevant evidence to support their argument/thinking
- drew valid conclusions as to the effect/implication of the characteristics on the genre

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

- showed “in depth” knowledge and wrote substantial answers that allowed them the ability to explain the effects on several levels
- often used appropriate critical opinion or applied academic theory to their study.
- chose recognised genres that allowed for the level of academic discussion required.
- drew insightful conclusions drawn from their argument.

Standard specific comments

Responses to the second part of the question that needed to be evenly weighted with their specific textual discussion, was too often left as an afterthought at the end of a paragraph.

Many candidates did not introduce their genre and characteristics well enough.

Level one candidates, presumably between 15 and 16 years old, are referencing texts beyond their legal viewing age.

There were several inappropriate genre choices – ‘hip hop’ and ‘grunge’ being musical genres for example.

Many candidates used characteristics that weren’t specific to their genre, such as ‘close-ups,’ ‘location’ or ‘music.’

Aspects such as ‘Fandom’ was described as a characteristic, rather than an implication.

Clearly, there is also some excellent teaching of genre in some schools, allowing their candidates to respond in a comprehensive and thoughtful way.

Media Studies subject page

Previous years' reports

[2016 \(PDF, 0KB\)](#)

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority