

# Assessment Report

---

## On this page

[91490: Demonstrate understanding of an aspect of a media industry](#) ▼

[91493: Demonstrate understanding of a relationship between a media genre and society](#) ▼

## Level 3 Media Studies 2019

Standards [91490](#) [91493](#)

## Part A: Commentary

Many candidates presented perceptive, critical, and well-supported discussions demonstrating thoughtful and reasoned insights into media issues and genre.

When dealing with both the industry and genre papers, candidates may agree or disagree with the statement, but should not use a 'disagree' stance to present a 'learned' essay. There must be a genuine argument that is developed in relation to the statement.

Information included in responses should be relevant; too many candidates still want to write everything they have been taught instead of arguing in a succinct, specific, and critical way. Rote-learned responses do not demonstrate a candidate's ability to evaluate meaning and media contexts.

Candidates need to respond to their chosen statement/question in order to demonstrate a critical understanding of genre and industry. They need to develop a focused argument showing independent engagement with the material studied.

Candidates should be discriminating when selecting the statement they will respond to. It must allow them to develop a persuasive argument based on their studied genre or industry.

## Part B: Report on standards

### 91490: Demonstrate understanding of an aspect of a media industry

---

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- attempted the question and gave evidence/detail that was relevant to the industry being discussed
- used the introduction and conclusion to address the question often but did not structure their response around answering the question
- explained an aspect of the industry by giving some reasons for how and/or why the aspect has occurred or functioned
- used relevant evidence or supporting details but were too general.

Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not identify a valid industry
- tried to rewrite a genre essay to suit industry
- did not identify a clear aspect of an industry
- presented rote-learned essays, or essays that did not engage with the question
- chose the wrong question to suit the information they were intent on discussing
- focused on describing parts of an industry rather than explaining how/why an aspect of industry operated
- made generalised points about an aspect of industry
- gave insufficient detail or evidence to support their points.

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

- addressed and returned to their chosen statement in a coherent and generally sustained manner
- showed analysis of the aspect of the industry
- attempted to develop an argument throughout the response
- provided relevant evidence/supporting details to support their points
- moved beyond a straightforward historical overview to analyse the impact on the industry and/or society
- attempted to explore implications but relied too much on opinion-based articles rather than objective-based research.

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

- wrote in a fluent manner and used a wide range of detail in relation to their discussion
- responded to their chosen statement in a thoughtful, insightful and convincing manner
- used the essay question to frame their response and clearly developed an argument responding to the statement
- demonstrated critical understanding of an aspect of an industry, including the impact of the aspect of these on industry, commerce, or society
- supported their essays with a well-chosen range of evidence, both from industry and theory, and incorporated this throughout the essay
- understood how wider aspects of industry worked together.

### Standard specific comments

Some candidates failed to identify an aspect of the industry or provide enough detail in their response to demonstrate that they understood how that aspect operated.

Some candidates provided far too much detail about the history of the industry which limited their ability to advance their argument or relate to their chosen statement, e.g. first there were CDs, then vinyl, then Napster, and finally Spotify.

The questions themselves were quite broad and many candidates seemed to scan the questions for the 'aspect' they wanted and respond without focusing on the particulars of the question, e.g. when discussing Statement Four, 'Access has empowered audiences', some candidates focused on increased access but ignored the empowerment or audience part of the question.

The most popular aspects discussed by the candidates were around the changing technology within industry – most commonly music, television, and social media. Again, many candidates appeared to have decided before the exam that this would be what they would focus on, regardless of which question they chose.

Some candidates seemed unsure how to discuss relationships within media industries and some struggled with exploring local content beyond broadcasting in New Zealand.

---

## 91493: Demonstrate understanding of a relationship between a media genre and society

---

Candidates who were awarded Achievement commonly:

- discussed a society or audience specific to their chosen genre
- used evidence from a range of generic texts to demonstrate understanding of the genre as a whole
- showed an understanding of a specific society and how it related to genre
- used at least two texts in their discussion
- were textually focused to a degree, but presented enough discussion of genre and society to show an understanding of the relationship
- structured their essays with a film/text per body paragraph, often starting those paragraphs with the text title (this text-by-text approach limited the depth of discussion and consideration given to the genre)

- based discussion in terms of media representation rather than genre (this was most notable with women in science fiction, action, or superhero films, or toxic masculinity in war or westerns).

Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- used rote-learned responses which did not address the chosen question
- could identify a society/genre relationship but could not clearly explain how and/or why that relationship existed
- wrote a 'compare and contrast' essay between two texts within a genre (this limited the discussion as the response became more about the differences in the two texts rather than how the texts explored or revealed the relationship between the genre and the society)
- discussed the genre too generally or simplistically, without enough evidence to illustrate their points
- were too textually focused, with little evidence to show an understanding of genre (this happened more often when candidates started their paragraphs with the text).

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

- moved beyond discussing the genre text-by-text and considered the genre component and its societal counterpart
- used secondary sources/theorists confidently to show the relationship between genre and society to clarify and expand points made using primary evidence
- referred to the question consistently, using it as a springboard to delve deeply into analysis
- used detailed evidence to support their argument from within the text and from academic secondary sources to support their discussion.

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

- wrote fluently, cohesively and with a line of argument, linked to the question, threaded throughout the essay
- referenced a wide range of relevant texts and secondary sources supporting their arguments

- made original and/or perceptive points about the impacts of their genre / society
- showed an understanding of the complex relationship between society and genre
- presented a discussion moving fluidly between texts within paragraphs rather than separating texts into separate paragraphs (this allowed for better understanding of the relationship by supporting societal points with more than one text)
- understood the significance of the genre for the society in that time and place and explored a chain of influences between the genre and the society which spoke to the relationship
- considered clearly how genre conventions had a societal counterpart evident in more than one text (these were then explored and examined in a what/so what/now what progression).

### **Standard specific comments**

The genre that is selected for study is crucial. There were a lot of 'genres' that were not actual genres but instead were movements, themes, or historical events (e.g. black civil rights, gay rights, Disney princesses, the media, etc). Candidates who did not write on a genre were disadvantaged.

Texts should be selected which align to specific threads within a genre or sub-genre, e.g. technophobia in the dystopian genre would allow candidates to build a more cohesive and robust response than trying to cover different aspects or poorly linked texts in what has become a large, multi-faceted genre.

Breaking very broad/wide genres down into sub-genre allows candidates better opportunity to go into more detail and make more perceptive points. This was done well with Horror – with Zombie, Vampire, Slasher essays. This should be applied to other genres too, e.g. rather than just looking at documentary or even social issue documentary – it works better to take a particular focus, e.g. corporate greed, politics, environment, food. Narrowing down by sub-genre allows for better analysis, as well as societal discussion.

## [Media Studies subject page](https://www.nzqa.govt.nz/ncea/subjects/assessment-reports/media-studies-13/)

## Previous years' reports

[2018 \(PDF, 113KB\)](#)

[2017 \(PDF, 48KB\)](#)

[2016 \(PDF, 215KB\)](#)

LIVE

---

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority