

# **National Certificate of Educational Achievement**

## **2011 Assessment Report**

### **Media Studies Level 1**

- 90991 Demonstrate understanding of the media coverage of a current issue or event**
- 90992 Demonstrate understanding of characteristics of a media genre**

## COMMENTARY

Candidates' performance was generally consistent across both exam papers. For each standard, candidates who clearly addressed the statements and provided a clear structure in their responses were most successful. Candidates who generalised and were unable to support their assertions with evidence were less able to succeed. Candidates need to link their response in both parts of the paper so that they were able to expand their discussion holistically.

The use of detailed, relevant, and specific evidence to supported discussion was vital to success. The use of inappropriate topics for both papers often highlighted a lack of maturity and led candidates off topic.

Rote-learned essay responses were made obvious as candidates were betrayed not only by a lack of engagement with the parts of the question, but limited also how the parts of the question related to and relied on each other as a scaffold to show a comprehensive understanding.

## STANDARD REPORTS

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

#### **ACHIEVEMENT**

**Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:**

- described specific chosen aspects of media coverage in the presentation of a current issue/event
- used relevant evidence to support their description of how these aspects were used in the media coverage of a current issue/event
- responded in terms of focussing on the media coverage rather than the current issue/event itself.

#### **NOT ACHIEVED**

**Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:**

- described the current issue/event rather than the media coverage of the issue/event
- offered generalised and/or vague responses about the issue/event and/or its media coverage
- discussed only one aspect of media coverage across the paper
- did not include sufficient evidence, or any evidence at all, to support or validate their discussion in parts or throughout the paper
- referred to "the media" rather than specific sources or validated coverage
- wrote in insufficient depth to show understanding of media coverage.

## **ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT**

**In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:**

- offered specific and valid reasons to explain why the media covered the issue/event in a particular way
- had a detailed knowledge of the event/issue and how news value(s), practice(s), regulation(s), commercial or political consideration(s) and/or audience expectation(s) validated the chosen coverage
- provided detailed and relevant evidence to support or prove reasons for the media coverage.

## **ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE**

**In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:**

- offered detailed explanation of a specific effect of the media coverage of a current issue/event
- offered thoughtful reasons to explain why or how the media coverage had an effect and justified this in relation to relevant evidence
- considered how particular aspect(s) of media coverage of the current issue/event had a direct relationship with the reasons for its use and could conclude on the effect of this use
- used evidence to draw insightful conclusions for the reasons that the media coverage had an intended effect or impact because of the type of coverage used.

## **OTHER COMMENTS**

Candidates who described the aspects of media coverage either before or in relation to the current issue/event fared considerably better than those who did not.

Candidates who wrote about the event itself often did not demonstrate an understanding of the media coverage.

Candidates who discussed only “the media” often made vague, generalised, and/or emotive statements that were not supported by specific evidence. This was particularly evident at Part (b) where sweeping statements, rather than judicious and/or valid conclusions, were offered that had no connection to the reasoned explanation of the coverage attempted in Part (a) of the response.

Candidates who understood the chosen aspects, and the reasons why these could or would be applied to the specific media coverage of the issue/event, were more likely to consider and discuss the direct or wider effect of this particular coverage.

Candidates who wrote superficially about a number of effects in Part (b) were disadvantaged and failed to show a comprehensive understanding in terms of reasoned explanations of the effects of the media coverage in the presentation of a current issue or event.

The performance outcome for candidates was impacted by choice of topic. The current issue/event was best when specific and within a timeframe. Larger news topics such as

those to do with a geographical location in the world or drug legalization were often too broad.

## **90992 Demonstrate understanding of characteristics of a media genre**

### **ACHIEVEMENT**

**Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:**

- described two identifying characteristics of a media genre
- used relevant evidence to support their description of the characteristics in use in the chosen genre
- responded in terms of focusing on the two characteristics of the genre rather than the use in one specific media text.

### **NOT ACHIEVED**

**Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:**

- described only one characteristic of a media genre rather than the two required by the standard
- provided a generalised and/or vague response about one or both characteristics
- did not provide sufficient evidence to support their discussion for the two characteristics
- identified characteristics common to a medium rather than a specific genre such as soundtrack, special effects, lighting, narrative, or costume
- described the characteristic as it was used in one media text without actually linking the description to the chosen media genre so that the response became a close reading of a text rather than a description of two characteristics of a media genre
- did not provide enough depth in their discussion to demonstrate understanding of the two characteristics of a media genre.

### **ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT**

**In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:**

- provided reasoned explanation for how and/or why both characteristics are used in the media genre
- offered at least one reasoned explanation for how each characteristic is used in at least one media text and how this use relates to the genre itself
- provided sufficient detailed and relevant evidence to demonstrate in-depth understanding of the two characteristics of the chosen genre.

### **ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE**

**In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:**

- produced a discussion that examined in detail an effect (implication) of the use of both characteristics of the media genre
- drew at least one valid conclusion or consequence of the use of two characteristics in a media genre. This may have meant that the candidate combined the two

characteristics into a discussion of one effect/implication but they would have provided sufficient judicious evidence for each characteristic to demonstrate comprehensive understanding of the two characteristics of the media genre

- provided judicious evidence supporting valid and even insightful conclusions and/or consequences demonstrating convincing understanding of the two characteristics.

## **OTHER COMMENTS**

Candidates who discussed characteristics general to a medium rather than a specific genre such as narrative, soundtrack, or costume generally found it harder to go beyond generalisations and assertions as to their use and possible effects in the genre identified.

Candidates who wrote in a generalised way about a number of possible implications for the genre rather than explaining or examining the use of the characteristics themselves in the genre were disadvantaged particularly in Part (b) of the paper.

Candidates who addressed implications such as representation or commercial considerations in a general way in Part (b) often did not draw a specific conclusion or consequence for the genre or these were unrelated to the characteristics discussed in Part (a).

Some candidates provided responses to genre more suited to the Level 2 and/or 3 genre papers. This made it difficult for candidates to meet the requirements of this standard in particular.