

Assessment Report

On this page

[91248: Demonstrate understanding of the relationship between a media product and its audience](#) ▼

[91251: Demonstrate understanding of an aspect of a media genre](#) ▼

Level 2 Media Studies 2018

Standards [91248](#) [91251](#)

Part A: Commentary

Candidates who directly responded to the question throughout their response often wrote concisely, and accurately, with some degree of originality to achieve a good result.

Candidates whose responses did not address the question often drifted off topic and produced irrelevant material that seemed to have been rote learned without understanding. These candidates struggled to achieve.

Part B: Report on standards

91248: Demonstrate understanding of the relationship between a media product and its audience

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- addressed the chosen statement throughout
- provided evidence that was mostly sourced and accurate
- identified clearly and described an audience and a product
- used supporting evidence.

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

- failed to address their chosen statement
- provided insufficient detail of the target audience
- described or close read a media product in detail rather than focusing their discussion on the relationship between the product and its audience
- described a genre or medium rather than a specific media product, e.g. psychological thrillers or social media.

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

- explained, in detail, the connection between the target audience and the product
- provided evidence commonly from beyond the text to support the explanation
- used consistently sourced and accurate evidence to support the explanation
- showed in-depth understanding by providing discussion supported by evidence.

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

- demonstrated critical understanding by providing a detailed examination of a consequence, implication or effect of the relationship identified in their chosen statement, with detailed evidence from credible sources
- provided insightful discussion and evidence to justify their ideas.

Standard specific comments

Candidates who used up-to-date texts and current evidence were more likely to demonstrate a deep understanding of the context of the relationship between the media product and audience.

Rote-learned responses using an obvious writing frame or the use of pre-prepared evidence inhibited candidates from responding to the chosen statement.

91251: Demonstrate understanding of an aspect of a media genre

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- addressed the question and gave detail from two media texts and/or other sources
- attempted explanations, but in very broad terms, giving explanations that were anecdotal as opposed to reasoned explanations with supporting detail
- described a commercial consideration, audience expectation, or a change within the genre
- used relevant textual evidence
- wrote text-focused responses, with minimal exploration of how these were representative of the genre.

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

- did not have enough evidence, or listed films, rather than giving details about them
- close read texts rather than discussing genre
- chose texts that did not support the aspect being discussed
- did not address the aspect that they chose, i.e. the essays were often set up as change, but then no actual change was discussed (it tended to be a

textual analysis and/or comparison)

- did not adequately describe the aspect of the media genre
- wrote about two distinct texts without describing them in terms of the aspect of the genre.

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

- responded to their chosen statement using keywords throughout their discussion
- often discussed more than two texts showing an in-depth knowledge of the genre
- used supporting detail from the genre, genre theory, box office and critical response, or other sources to support their explanations
- gave an in-depth, focused response about the aspect and covered it in depth
- moved beyond a descriptive response and provided a reasoned explanation supporting their claims
- provided an explanation of why the aspect was important to the genre
- developed an argument throughout the response, e.g. the importance of audience for commercial considerations, or the specific audience response to specific aspects of the genre
- addressed and returned to the question throughout the essay response
- explored how/why the aspect chosen to write about affects the genre
- examined, in detail, reasons for how or why a genre has changed often linking to societal changes and unpacking these
- started going beyond the texts or genre and referencing relevant societal shifts and/or secondary material to support answers.

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

- discussed a range of appropriate texts in detail
- made logical and valid conclusions pertinent to the genre discussed, as opposed to generic assumptions
- used the essay question to frame their response and clearly set up the line of argumentation their essay was going to take

- demonstrated critical understanding of aspects of genre and the impact of these on genre, commerce or audience
- displayed a critical understanding of the complexities of the aspect for audience, society and/or genre
- used judicious examples to support argumentation
- showed a wide understanding of the genre, often referencing secondary material to support their answers (e.g. box office statistics, rotten tomatoes, quotes, reviews, etc.)
- integrated secondary examples into the aspect being discussed in a perceptive way
- looked to the future of the genre in terms of their aspect
- made valid comments about the direction of the genre that were integrated into the detail of their response
- showed an awareness that impacts on audiences do not solely result from the films or genre they had studied, but are part of a wider cultural/societal picture
- responded to the question with some degree of originality or perception
- incorporated discussion of all the aspects of the standard (e.g. how change leads to audience response and how this affects commercial considerations).

Standard specific comments

There is to some extent, still an issue with rote-learned and pre-prepared responses that are too similar to other candidates from that school.

This is a standard where candidates are expected to discuss an aspect of a media genre. This needs to be clearly understood by the candidate. Many candidates discuss too many aspects, which weakens their overall argument, e.g. “the genre of X changes in response to audience expectations, technology, feminism, and society”. This is likely true for all genres, but discussing all four of these aspects in a response, limits a student’s ability to demonstrate critical understanding.

Some genres lend themselves to a richer discussion of ‘an aspect’, while other genres make it difficult for the student to achieve at a high level. Careful consideration needs to be given to the selection of a genre.

Misapplication of theory is common. While it is great to see students engaging with theory, there are many irrelevant discussions concerning definitions of genre theory or examinations of theory, which do not support the discussion. To be successful at this level, the theory must be applied to the genre studied, rather than be generic.

When answering commercial consideration type questions, it is still important for candidates to give detail of the texts, beyond just listing budget and box office details.

Candidates who tried to discuss too many features/conventions of their genre as an aspect of change often struggled to get the level of depth required in their essay. For instance, with the horror genre, it would be better to focus on either change in violence OR change in the role of women, but not both.

Candidates need to be confident in their choice of appropriate texts within genres. Often candidates struggle to achieve higher grades when discussing texts which do not clearly connect within an aspect of the genre. They may be in the same genre, yet tenuous links undermine responses. For example, comparing *Nosferatu* with *Twilight* does highlight many changes in the genre, but often this type of span does not allow students to critically engage with a specific change or development/commercial consideration or audience response.

[Media Studies subject page](#)

Previous years' reports

[2017 \(PDF, 46KB\)](#) [2016 \(PDF, 216KB\)](#)