

Part A: Commentary

Comment on the overall response of candidates to 2015 examinations for all achievement standards covered by this report.

Candidates who addressed a statement and used appropriate examples from texts or other relevant evidence achieved. Candidates who did not address a statement struggled to achieve.

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 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.

The choice of appropriate examples of media products and texts continues to be important. Many candidates did not achieve because their products and / or texts were not relevant to the context they were discussing or were limited in their scope to meet the requirements of the standard. 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 candidates continue to discuss media products and texts that are either inappropriate and / or age-restricted. The nature of each standard does not require viewing or participation of this kind of material, and teachers should be vigilant in maintaining censorship protocols to avoid candidates discussing graphic sexual or violent content.

Part B: Report on standards

1. Assessment Report for 91248: Demonstrate understanding of the relationship between a media product and its audience

<p>Achieved</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> described the target audience in clear terms using relevant identifying characteristics used specific evidence to describe the relationship focused their discussion on an aspect of the relationship between a media product and its audience used the chosen statement to guide their response.
<p>Not Achieved</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> did not identify a specific media product or a specific target audience. These kind of responses typically focused on media genres (e.g. horror films) or subjects that are not normally classified as media products (e.g. music concerts) could not describe an aspect of a relationship between a media product and its audience made generalised, inaccurate, speculative and/or emotive responses about the relationship that were unsupported by sufficient evidence did not address the specifics of the statement chosen, e.g. described a media product or a range of media products without sufficient description of its relationship with its target audience. Such responses typically read more like a close reading of a media product or a history of a particular media product wrote with insufficient detail to demonstrate understanding of the relationship.

Achieved with Merit	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explained how and / or why a relationship between a media product and its audience operate • provided specific and often detailed evidence (from the media product and /other relevant sources) to support their explanation of the relationship, often comparing or contrasting with similar media products • clearly addressed one of the statements, providing valid reasons and justification as to why the aspect connected a media product with its audience • attempted to discuss consequences but did not provide sufficient supporting detail or evidence.
Achieved with Excellence	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • used specific, supporting evidence from the relationship and were able to discuss consequences /implications of the aspect of the relationship – such as economic/commercial, social/political, historical/cultural considerations, etc. • demonstrated understanding of the complexities of the relationship by making comparisons to other media products in a meaningful and valid manner, with relevant and specific discussion and supporting evidence • provided a critical understanding of the nature of the relationship • developed their responses by referring clearly to the specifics of their chosen statement in a sustained manner, using supporting evidence • referred to information from a range of sources, i.e. media commentators, academics and / or academic theories, and / or articles, websites, etc. to support their argument.
Standard specific comments	<p>The majority of candidates selected Statement 1 (followed by Statements 3 & 2) as the aspect on which they based their discussion of the relationship.</p> <p>There was a good range of media products used this year. Similar to last year, NZTA's PSA advertisements, NZ based tv dramas, news shows and magazines, overseas magazines (Girlfriend, Dolly), overseas based dramas/sitcoms/animations (Family Guy, Modern Family, Community, Glee, Burka Avenger ,etc) and specific NZ radio stations such as The Edge are examples of media products that were used by successful candidates. Nevertheless, some candidates continue to choose media products that are inappropriate and / or age restricted or that do not provide sufficient material to meet the requirements of the standard – particularly those focused on events (e.g. Armageddon Expo, Homegrown). In addition some candidates seemed to use the standard as an extension of the Level 2 genre standard (91251). Those that responded in this manner were disadvantaged and often could not identify a particular audience or address a statement adequately.</p> <p>Discussion of detailed demographic information from such sources as Neilson or the Radio Bureau or NZTA allowed candidates to describe audiences in some depth. However, candidates that focused their discussion on measurement needed to also refer to how the findings from audience measurement affected the product with specific evidence in order to achieve.</p> <p>Candidates who examined changes in the media product (particularly as a result of economic, political, cultural or social effects) over time often demonstrated a more in-depth understanding of the relationship between the product and its target audience.</p> <p>Candidates fared well when they were able to provide verifiable evidence for their explanations about the relationship. However, many candidates wrote long-winded responses using hypothetical examples or references to theory without referring to specific examples from their chosen media texts. These candidates tended to be penalised.</p> <p>Many candidates attempted to discuss consequences of the relationship but frequently failed to provide any evidence for their assertions outside of suppositions. Although media/audience theory can help explain how and why aspects of the relationship between a media product and its audience operate, candidates continue to struggle to apply these theories within the context of the relationship.</p>

2. Assessment Report for 91251: Demonstrate understanding of an aspect of a media genre

<p>Achieved</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> used relevant, if limited evidence of primary sources to demonstrate their chosen aspect addressed the statement and gave detail from two media texts clearly described the aspect they were addressing attempted to describe how or why these aspects came about, however these were often underdeveloped and sweeping generalisations.
<p>Not Achieved</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> did not provide sufficient detail or evidence of texts did not demonstrate sufficient understanding of the aspect wrote about too many aspects and only gave one example per aspect provided a history of the genre rather than just describing a significant change wrote about an aspect not specifically related to any particular genre e.g. use of close ups.
<p>Achieved with Merit</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> described how and OR why a change occurred, and linked this to genre, technology or society at the time explained the aspect in relation to its role within its genre i.e. Sci-Fi as a once male-dominated genre using stronger female characters to appeal to a wider audience used audience response and commercial considerations to support answers on a change in an aspect showed understanding of the genre beyond the specific texts used for evidence by making appropriate links to secondary, critical sources and / or commentary stated implications without examining them with sufficient detail or insight for award of Excellence.
<p>Achieved with Excellence</p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> addressed all three aspects of the standard in the same essay to show their effect on one another: for example, discussing a change in the genre with reference to the intended audience of the genre/individual texts and box office figures/recognition of financial returns discussed implications specific to the genre that was either a natural progression from the evidence presented, supported by further evidence or built on points raised throughout the essay to create a cumulative and cohesive argument made assertions about the future direction that were unpacked and integrated throughout the essay rather than tacked on at the end made relevant and effective connections to critical sources and / or media theories to develop the argument explored the complexities of the genre by comparing and contrasting the effect of the aspects on other genres or media.
<p>Standard specific comments</p>	<p>The most successful candidates engaged with the statements and referred back to them throughout the essay.</p> <p>Lack of evidence is a key reason why many candidates fail to achieve. Some candidates mentioned many texts but did not give specific detail about any of them.</p> <p>Although secondary sources are useful it is still important that candidates provide evidence directly from the texts studied.</p> <p>Genres that were written about successfully included: western films, horror films, zombie films, vampire films, Sci-Fi films and Sitcoms.</p> <p>Genres that tended to not work well for candidates included: James Bond films, social issue drama, Disney films and adult-oriented animated TV Comedy.</p> <p>Some candidates referred to media products that are inappropriate and / or age restricted or that do not provide sufficient material to meet the requirements of the standard.</p>

Discussion of franchises (such as James Bond, Star Trek, Batman) or remakes (such as Psycho) rather than genres were not generally successful as candidates struggled to demonstrate understanding of genre.

Some candidates' answers resembled close reading responses without discussion of genre. Conventions or aspects focused on should be specific to the genre, rather than conventions shared by a range of different products and/or texts, such as close-ups in film.

Candidates who attempt to cover too many conventions tend to fail to adequately provide sufficient depth in their response to explain how or why the aspect is significant.

Candidates should take care to remember accurate box office data and acknowledge sources for critical or statistical information. Grossly incorrect figures and assertions that could not be proved tended to undermine explanations.