

National Certificate of Educational Achievement

2012 Assessment Report

Media Studies Level 2

- 91248 Demonstrate understanding of the relationship between a media product and its audience**
- 90992 Demonstrate understanding of an aspect of a media genre**

COMMENTARY

Candidates who addressed the question and used appropriate examples from texts or other relevant evidence achieved.

Candidates did not address the question struggled to achieve. In particular candidates sometimes covered a range of aspects in their answer rather than concentrating on one aspect in depth. This also often limited candidates' ability to achieve at Merit or Excellence level.

In both standards, candidates who speculated and made vague and generalised comments without specific examples were unable to achieve. This was also an issue as candidates attempted to discuss consequences or implications at excellence level, often failing to support their ideas with any reference to supporting evidence.

The choice of appropriate examples of texts to use continues to be important. Many candidates did not achieve because their texts were not relevant to the context they were discussing. They were unable to use effectively texts to show evidence of the relationship between the audience and the product or show their understanding of the aspect of the genre.

Inappropriate media products; particularly, age-restricted (R-18) films, TV shows, video games, advertisements and magazines were used by some candidates.

STANDARD REPORTS

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

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates awarded Achievement typically:

- described the media product and target audience
- described at least one aspect of the relationship between the media product and its audience from the following range:– design/production/distribution/marketing and consumption of the product/identification, profiling, and targeting of the audience
- used relevant supporting evidence in their description of the relationship
- focused their discussion on one or more of the following - either the identification and/or measurement of a media audience, or the targeting of a media audience, or other elements of the relationship.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates awarded Not Achieved typically:

- failed to clearly identify a specific media product or target audience
- did not describe a sufficient link between either the identification and/or measurement of a media audience, or the targeting of a media audience, or other element that influence/create the relationship between a media product and its audience
- wrote vague, short and generalised responses that lacked sufficient evidence or details

- did not address the specifics of the question, often describing specific media genres (particularly film) or commercial entities without discussing a specific media product
- demonstrated a limited or no understanding of the relationship between a media product and the audience.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

Candidates awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- had a detailed knowledge of both the media product and its audience
- explained in detail how and, or, why the relationship between a media product and its audience operated
- provided specific detailed evidence from a media product and, or, other sources to support their explanation
- provided clear and valid reasons of how and, or, why one or more aspects of the relationship created or affected the relationship.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

Candidates awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- discussed the consequences and, or, implications of the relationship between a media product and its audience by providing reasoned observations or analysis
- critiqued the nature of the relationship, by examining either the wider issues and complexities of one or more aspects of the relationship
- integrated information from a wide range of sources to support their argument, i.e. media commentators/professionals, and/or academic theories, and/or articles, websites, etc.
- focused their discussion on the relationship of one media product and its target audience while making comparisons between similar media products to highlight the significance and effects of the relationship
- linked their discussion to such things as the relationship itself, or the media product, or the targeting of a media audience, identification and, or, measurement of an audience, other media, wider society, or other relevant issues.

OTHER COMMENTS:

Candidates who chose recent New Zealand media products were better able to support their responses with valid evidence. They had a better understanding of the target audience, the media product, and the environment in which they took place, than candidates who struggled with international products or genre/historical case studies. Products that worked well were the LTSA's Legend drink-driving TVC, New Zealand television programmes including Reservoir Hill, Go Girls, Campbell Live, local radio stations (particularly – The Edge, The Rock, More FM, etc); and local magazines, The Listener, Tearaway, Rip It Up, Wild Tomato, etc. Some overseas products did work, when supported with specific evidence e.g. Glee, American Idol and Girlfriend and Dolly magazine.

Candidates using foreign media products were often disadvantaged when applying these products to New Zealand audiences e.g. sitcoms that were tested and mediated for an American audience and exported into New Zealand as a finished media product did not do well when applied to New Zealand targeting systems, as the target market is American.

The use of products without clear audience data or information also made it difficult for candidates to provide valid descriptions about how and/or why a relationship existed. Products that appealed to a very broad and generic target audience e.g. Friends, Jersey Shore and Modern Family and advertisements for example, Lynx deodorant were also difficult to use to show this relationship.

Candidates who used products clearly more suited to a genre study found it difficult to show understanding of the relationship between a media product and its audience.

Candidates who chose to focus their discussion on a particular measuring technique such as people meters or radio surveys often failed to link their discussions with a media product. They tended to draw on speculative or irrelevant supporting evidence. Candidates who were successful demonstrated knowledge of how a specific product was affected by information used in the gathering of audience data.

Some providers misunderstood the definition of a media product, choosing to focus on a media event or media personality instead. As a result, candidates were disadvantaged when answering the question. Focusing on a medium rather than one specific media product: e.g. “magazines” in general rather than a specific title did not allow candidates to achieve.

Many candidates focused on a close reading of a media product rather than maintaining their focus on demonstrating their understanding of the relationship between a media product and its audience.

91251 Demonstrate understanding of an aspect of a media genre

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates awarded Achievement typically:

- clearly identified and described an aspect of the genre
- used supporting evidence from at least two texts with some detail
- discussed in terms of genre rather than specific texts
- demonstrated an understanding of what the question required of them.
- attempted to give reasons for why the aspect functions in their chosen genre
- chose and understood the question that best suited their knowledge of the topic (for example, instead of writing on a change to a genre that has changed very little they chose to write about audience expectations of, and response to that genre – which gave scope for a stronger, more reasoned response).

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates awarded Not Achieved typically:

- failed to demonstrate understanding of an aspect of the genre
- discussed change, audience, or commercial considerations but did not link this to an aspect of the genre
- did not provide enough detail to support their discussion- no specific scene or character names or events described
- did not provide evidence from at least two texts
- made over simplified or generalised discussion not linked to a specific aspect or genre

- wrote an a theme or character essay rather than engaging in discussion of the aspect and how it functioned in or impacts on the genre
- gave a history of the genre covering many decades without engaging in discussion of a specific change
- discussed more than one aspect, but did not cover any particular aspect in detail.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

Candidates awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- made valid comments about the chosen option's significance to the genre
- consistently used text to support their argument, relating this to the genre as a whole
- provided detailed and relevant descriptions of TWO or more films from the chosen genre
- gave an explanation about how the genre changed/ affected audience expectations or was affected by commercial concerns
- provided detailed evidence of texts through discussion of character, narrative, scene or quotes from each text
- defined and explained their aspect clearly early in their response and then focussed on an explanation of how/why these changes were significant for the genre
- discussed the genre as a whole rather than individual texts
- focused the discussion on one significant aspect of the genre across texts which allowed the response to develop depth and detail.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

Candidates awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- supported comprehensive analysis of the genre with detailed, relevant examples
- presented material in a coherent and well structured way
- discussed a wider implication of the aspect such as how the aspect has affected other genre or society
- showed an appreciation for the complexities of what makes a film/genre successful and/or why they need to adapt to meet audience expectations (regardless of their chosen aspect)
- went beyond the texts and included information from other sources such as statistics, box office numbers, quotes from film theorists, etc.
- made valid and reasoned predictions about the future of the genre backed up with evidence
- looked at commercial viabilities of the genre
- compared and contrasted the texts and the genre throughout the essay rather than isolating the texts
- demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the genre throughout the discussion balancing aspects with text evidence and contextual discussion effectively
- built an argument and drew reasoned conclusions about the aspect.

OTHER COMMENTS

Many candidates wrote on two or more aspects and this often weakened their response as they did not engage in discussion of how and why the aspect impacts on the genre.

Some inappropriate texts being used, for example gangster films (which were mostly R18).