

National Certificate of Educational Achievement

2013 Assessment Report

Media Studies Level 2

- 91248 Demonstrate understanding of the relationship between a media product and its audience**
- 91251 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 who did not address the question struggled to achieve. In particular, candidates who attempted to cover a range of aspects in their answer rather than concentrating on one aspect in depth generally did not demonstrate the depth of understanding required for achievement at Merit or Excellence level.

Candidates who performed very well demonstrated an in-depth analysis in their responses that clearly resulted from a prolonged and attentive study of the standard. This allowed candidates to incorporate media theory and a range of well-researched and reasoned consequences in their responses. In comparison, candidates who speculated and made vague and generalised comments without specific examples were unable to achieve. This was also an issue where candidates attempted to discuss consequences or implications at Excellence level, often failing to support their ideas with any reference to supporting evidence.

Responses that developed conclusions and judgements informed by relevant media theory tended to work well. These discussions reflected a media studies perspective. Discussions that focused on societal, economic, or political factors tended not to work. Similarly responses that focused upon theory sometimes lost sight of the specific requirements of the standards.

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 effectively use texts to show evidence of the relationship between the audience and the product or show their understanding of the aspect of the genre.

Some providers continue to study media products that have a censorship rating of R-18 (most notably video games, horror films, and age-restricted media events that have an adult orientated target audience). Whilst the nature of each standard does not necessarily require viewing or participation of this kind of material, teachers should be vigilant in maintaining censorship protocols.

STANDARD REPORTS

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

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates awarded Achievement commonly:

- described the relationship between the media product and its audience
- referred to at least one of the three aspects of the relationship between the chosen media product and its audience
- used specific supporting evidence when describing the relationship
- described the target audience and media product
- focused their description on how a technique used to appeal to a target audience or an audience identification/measurement technique creates a relationship.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates awarded Not Achieved commonly:

- did not identify a specific media product, producer or specific target audience
- could not describe an aspect of a relationship or connection between a media product and its audience
- made vague, generalised, inaccurate and/or emotive responses about the relationship between the media product and its audience
- wrote with insufficient detail to demonstrate the understanding of the relationship
- wrote a close reading of a media text (particularly film text(s)) with no reference to the relationship between the media product and its audience
- did not address the specifics of the question, e.g. described a media product or a range of media products without sufficient description of its relationship with an audience.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

Candidates awarded Achievement with Merit commonly:

- demonstrated an in-depth understanding of the relationship between a media product and its audience by explaining how and/or why the media product and its audience are connected
- provided specific and often detailed evidence to support their explanation of the relationship from at least one media text and/or other relevant sources
- provided valid reasons why at least one aspect of the relationship between the media product and its audience is created
- provided detailed information about the target audience and the media product.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

Candidates awarded Achievement with Excellence commonly:

- demonstrated critical understanding and/or insight of the nature of the relationship between the media product and its audience, by examining the consequences/ complexities and/or wider issues of one or more aspects of the relationship
- used specific, supporting evidence from the relationship and were able to discuss consequences/implications/effectiveness of at least one of the aspects of the relationship – such as techniques used to identify and/or measure; or techniques used to target a media audience; or other elements of the relationship
- focused their discussion on the relationship of one media product and its audience but made comparisons, in a meaningful and valid way, between similar media products in order to highlight the significance and effects on the overall relationship
- integrated information from a range of specific sources, i.e. media professionals, and/or academic theories, and/or articles, websites, etc. to support their argument.

OTHER COMMENTS

The majority of candidates selected 'targeting of a media audience', followed by the 'identification and/or measurement' as an aspect on which they based their response.

The use of relevant, specific, up-to-date examples of media products provided good scope for candidates to discuss relationship between the media product and its audience. *Burka Avenger, American Idol, Glee, The Factory, LTSA's "Legend" Drink Driving advertisement, NZ Listener, Girlfriend magazine*, and specific NZ radio stations (e.g. *the Edge, More FM*,

etc.) are examples of media products that were used by successful candidates. Likewise discussion of detailed demographic information from such sources as Neilson, the Radio Bureau and other web analytics allowed candidates to successfully discuss in depth the relationship between the media product and its audience. However, candidates that focused their discussion on measurement/identification often neglected to refer to how and/or why the findings from audience measurement affect the product with specific evidence.

A large number of candidates used source material that was obtained online and created by an external agency (e.g. LTSA's Drink Driving advertisements). Whilst this material provided a strong basis of description and adequate levels of explanation, sole reliance on this source material meant candidates demonstrated a rather narrow level of insight and therefore restricted them to generic implications and consequences.

Candidates who were able to describe an audience in some depth generally fared better than candidates who provided broad or generalised descriptions of an audience.

While plenty of candidates attempted to examine the consequences of the relationship, many discussions were often superficial, generic or speculative, making it difficult for students to achieve at Excellence. Implications need to be grounded in evidence with supporting detail and evidence (or draws on detail from earlier explanations), and the examination of consequences needs to be insightful and meaningful to be considered at Excellence level.

Some candidates chose media products that did not provide sufficient material or scope to meet the requirements of the standard. In particular, these were often a range of films from a particular genre such as Horror. These candidates commonly discussed a range of films or analyzed a particular film but could not adequately identify a target audience or describe a relationship between the media product and its audience. Such responses seemed more suitable for a discussion of changes in a media genre (91251) rather than the relationship between a media product and its audience.

91251 Demonstrate understanding of an aspect of a media genre

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates awarded Achievement typically:

- addressed the question to develop a description
- identified and described one aspect of the genre (change, commercial considerations or audience expectation and response)
- incorporated supporting evidence from at least two texts. For low Achievement, the evidence from the second text was often weak and lacked specific detail
- chose the question that best suited their knowledge of the topic and this gave scope for a stronger, more reasoned response. For example, instead of writing on a change to a genre that has changed very little, choosing to write about audience expectations of, and response to that genre.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates awarded Achievement commonly:

- did not address the specific question
- gave a history of the genre covering many decades without engaging in discussion of a specific aspect
- discussed multiple, unrelated aspects of the genre as opposed to building detail with one clear development or aspect
- failed to demonstrate sufficient understanding of the aspect of genre
- made over-simplified or generalised discussion not linked to specific aspect or genre
- compared two films with no real reflection on how this links to the genre
- lacked sufficient detail when discussing texts with no specific scene or character names or events described.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

Candidates awarded Achievement with Merit commonly:

- addressed the question to develop a detailed explanation
- explained why and/or how one aspect functioned and its immediate impacts, supported with reasons
- supported their explanation with specific and detailed evidence, often referring to more than two relevant texts
- discussed their chosen aspect of the genre in media terms rather than discussing themes or symbolism
- attempted to discuss implications and effects but did not support them with detailed evidence or explanation
- repeated lots of material that offered depth and detail but did not demonstrate insight or examination.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

Candidates awarded Achievement with Excellence commonly:

- addressed the question to develop a concise discussion
- examined the wider implications of the aspect on the genre and the audience/society
- demonstrated critical understanding of the significance of the aspect
- coherently weaved evidence into their answer, often including and examining how the aspect reflects relevant media theory
- provided insight into the complexities of an audience's response and expectations or commercial considerations of change in a media genre
- critically examined and appreciated the complex causes for success or failure within a genre
- maintained focus on the genre and/or the audience rather than societal relationships
- considered nuances of the aspect relating specifically to their genre rather than discussing features specific to the medium.

OTHER COMMENTS

Overall, candidate responses were generally focused on one aspect of a media genre.

Many candidates awarded Merit wrote detailed explanations that seemed to be organised upon the belief that repeating further, 'reasoned arguments', equals 'implications'. For many candidates awarded Merit the more they wrote the more formulaic and list-like their response became. Longer responses often introduced errors and less convincing material.

Some candidates provided responses about texts that were linked thematically such as films about racism or from less well-established genres such as reality-based TV dramas, rather than clearly defined genres. This limited their ability to show a developed understanding of the chosen aspect.

Many candidates attempted responses more suitable for the level three paper and focused their discussions on the relationship between a media genre and society. This approach was generally not successful. Candidates are expected to focus on the genre rather than lengthy discussions of societal factors.