

Assessment Report

Level 1 Media Studies 2016

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

Part A: Commentary

Candidates provided too many answers that were rote-learned essays that did not allow them to show comprehensive, or in-depth understanding.

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

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 it 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 the 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 candidates had selected appropriate stories that allowed them to explore broader issues in depth, however a number 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
- described two significant characteristics of their chosen genre
- supplied examples of characteristics in 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 (even one text for each characteristic could be accepted, unless for Question Two, where one example could not show how a characteristic was typical)
- failed to introduce the genre and show any understanding of the genre
- discussed only 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
- 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 from their argument.

Standard-specific comments

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

There were also concerns that Level One students, presumably 15 and 16 years old, were referencing texts beyond their legal viewing age. There were several inappropriate genre choices, e.g. “hip hop” and “grunge”, which are musical genres.

Many candidates also used characteristics that were not specific to their genre, such as “close-ups”, “location”, or “music”.

Aspects such as “fandom” were described as a characteristic, rather than an implication.

[Media Studies subject page](#)

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority