TOP SCHOLAR

NZQA

NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

QUALIFY FOR THE FUTURE WORLD
KIA NOHO TAKATŪ KI TŌ ĀMUA AO!

Scholarship 2016
Media Studies

9.30 a.m. Thursday 1 December 2016
Time allowed: Three hours
Total marks: 32

ANSWER BOOKLET

Check that the National Student Number (NSN) on your admission slip is the same as the number at the top of this page.

Choose TWO questions from Question Booklet 93303Q, and write your answers in this booklet.

Use pages 2 and 12 to write the numbers of your chosen questions and to plan your ideas. Begin your first answer on page 3 and your second answer on page 13.

If you need more room for any answer, use the extra space provided at the back of this booklet.

Check that this booklet has pages 2–23 in the correct order and that none of these pages is blank.

YOU MUST HAND THIS BOOKLET TO THE SUPERVISOR AT THE END OF THE EXAMINATION.

Question	Mark	
	Subject knowledge	
	Critical thinking	
	Subject knowledge	
	Critical thinking	
TOTAL		
		/32

ASSESSOR'S USE ONLY

Scholarship Media

Planning:

Question One: New Media must be Snackable and Shareable. Agree with the statement.

Media type: Social Media. Society: Britain and America

Rise of Social Media as a way to share new media. Click Bait and what it means (relating to the Snackable and shareable thing). Why this came around. (Desire for quick news and the ability to share things easily)

The ways in which this influences society; fast easy news stories.

Example of the US election and the ' Fake News' that came out of it.

Fake news stories being 48% more popular (Times)

59% of people saying ' social media is their prime source for news' (Washington Post)

Case study of the US election: Candidates can create feelings, people' s feelings are more important than facts, therefore Candidates can create facts. Alarming consequences of doing so.

12 Billion hours of media coverage, mainly focusing on unimportant things (Donald Trump Scandals).

Overall Impact. Brexit, US Election, Facebook 'Investigating ways of mediating fake news' (Mark Zuckerberg) yet damage already done.

Impact on Society moving forwards.

The rise of Social Media as a form of interaction and communication is one that is unparalleled in human history. It has facilitated huge amounts of positive change in ways we could never have thought possible. Yet it has also had other, less positive effects. Mark Weldon's statement of 'New media must be Snackable and Shareable ' is one that certainly holds true as all of us have seen in the last year. The ' Snackable and Shareable' media that was shared on social media platforms played a key part in events this year, the Brexit decision and the US election in particular. Therefore, this essay shall examine the role this new 'Snackable and Shareable' media has played on these events and analyse the relationship it has with these societies.

The rise of social media in the forms of Facebook and Twitter, among other, has for the first time in history facilitated our inner desires as people to have access to fast, easy and exciting access to forms of media whenever we like. Whether it be funny photos, a way to interact with friends or simply a platform to waste time on, Social media has provided many opportunities and experiences. All of these however have not been positive. The platforms ability to connect websites to millions has been a particularly interesting consequence. In the face of being paid by the numbers of views that a website gets, a new trend called 'Click Bait' arose quickly. We have all seen these types of things (that are usually unbelievable) such as the classic 'Russia Women want to be your girlfriend' or other ridiculous claims. However, these claims are only ridiculous in our capacity to recognise their falsehoods. With the US election this idea o

Bait was taken to a new level, providing small, Snackable news stories and an easy way to share them to all of a user's friends. All manner of news companies and other media outlets soon caught on to the fact that if they could use a ridiculous headline (e.g. Donald Trump sues child (?) that was even somewhat credible they could get huge numbers of views and therein by make an enormous amount of money.

At this stage, it may seem that this essay will descend into a politically bias opinion editorial outlining the reasons President-Elect Donald Trump was able to be elected. However, this is not what this essay shall focus on. The idea behind this is to show the relationship between this new 'Snackable and Shareable' media and the effects that it had on society. For the rise of click bait and the role that social media had in facilitating it has been significant. This is due to the nature of social media, a poll by the Washington Post found that 59% of those it asked used social media as 'their prime source for news'. This shows the increasing trend away from traditional media towards that of social media however that is a different essay entirely. What is important is that by having a largely captive audience what is able to be propagated on the platform is wildly varying. When a user would log onto Facebook and is faced with two different news a1ticles, one from the BBC detailing the intricacies of the charges laid against Miss Clinton and another titled from an unknown source stating 'Clinton sends funding to ISIS!!!!' the user would tend to click the fake news story. Our inner desire for this fast Snackable news which we can then share to all our friends is what facilitates this. Another study from the Times found that these fake news stories were 48% more popular than their counterparts. These of course happened on both sides of the aisle yet that is not what is important, it is their effect that is

As stated, these stories are only made dangerous by our capacity as users to identify the fake from the real. What media outlets soon found was that the more ridiculous the claim to a point, the more clicks it got. These clicks generated views which in turn generated revenue for those websites. By pulling on our inner desire to view these often scandalous news stories, these media outlets would do anything to get our clicks. At the beginning of the year we saw the first way this influenced society in the Brexit decision. Click Bait stories around the problems of immigrants, why EU standards were appalling and why Britain should leave the EU were everywhere. Combine their abundance with an extremely way of distributing these stories and you begin to have issues. If a leading politician such as Nigel Farage is saying that we send X number of million to the EU each week, that we are losing jobs to immigrants and other claims then if even 40% of those reading these stories trust these people and what they are saying then you have a problem. The way in which these stories can influence people was immense as was seen in the decision. At the time, people' s capacity to discern between fact and fiction was blurred by the abundance of these seemingly credible news stories. It is fair to say then that these stories influenced millions with dire consequenc

Having lost the ability to discern between fact and fiction million entered voting booths and voted to leave the EU. The votes were counted and those in favour of leaving outweighed those in favour of staying. A huge number of these people who wanted to leave believed that by voting to leave they would 'get the freshest eggs without them Poles taken em' according to one Londoner, along with other false reasons. What happened next was almost comical. Overnight the two most common google searches were 'What is the EU' and ' What does leaving the EU mean for Britain'. The following morning millions, after finding out finally the gravity of the decision they had made called for a re-vote. Of course, there was no re-vote, that

Comment [DB2]: Begins analysis of social media as a necessary and invasive part of our lives. Addresses consequences of this by raising commercialization of social media and how advertisers tap into innate desires of people. Addresses the question and further defines what 'snackable news stories' are.

Comment [DB3]: Addresses advantages and consequences of news distribution via personalized social media platforms Appropriate examples used: US Election, Washington Post poll: Analytical point generic and simple but begins analysis of both accessibility (positive) and quality (negative) or news distribution on social media.

Comment [DB4]: Establishes examples and consequences: Brexit and how sensationalist news stories use click bait techniques

is not how democracy and the British government is still trying to deal with how to exit the EU and how to do so. The two leading politicians that propelled the movement London Mayer Boris Johnson and UKIP party leader Nigel Farage both attempted to distance themselves from the nightmare they had created, Johnson stating he would not run again and Farage distancing himself from the party he leads and the Brexit decision. Safe to say, these Snackable and shareable new forms of media were extremely detrimental._.,,---

At this point we can see the negative effects of these Click Bait news stories that provided million with Snackable and shareable media. We would have thought that those who were facilitating these stories would do something about it, yet they did not. Therefore, we were given another case study in the dangers of this type of new media, the US election. Media outlets initially latched onto Donald Trump and begun writing about him. Stories like his desire to build a wall and have Mexico pay for it were perfect material for Click Bait stories. They revelled in it making huge revenues. Trump was an extremely effective money making machine in that he said ridiculous things that could be written about making media outlets money. It soon did not matter whether what Trump was saying and whether it was true or not only in that it generated quick shareable media that could be published. The focus quickly turned to what other candidates were saying around policy to the next controversial statement Trump made. Things like Obama creating ISIS (literally then later figuratively), Clinton being in arms with ISIS and her alleged corruption were particularly effective. Of the 12 Billion hours of news time that happened throughout the election the focus turned from that of investigative journalism to the fastest way to get clicks and views. By the time both candidates were chosen tens of millions were watching, sharing and talking about the election online.,,,,.,-.

Where the issue comes in is once again the lack of ability to discern what it true and what is not. This combined with a large number of people who did not care about the truth at all. Donald Trump was the first candidate to utilize the power of Twitter in particular to connect with millions of his supporters and communicate to them quickly and effectively. In the growing quagmire the truth no longer seemed to matter. An interesting point that Journalist John Oliver point out was that this is because people's feelings were more important than facts. If people do not feel safer in inner cities, then no amount of statistics will dissuade them of this. And if Candidates can create feeling that override facts then by logical process they can illogically create facts. Users no longer cared about long, dull but true explanations of events only choosing instead to view what was interesting. By the conclusion of the election it no longer mattered whether articles about 'Obama being a Muslim' were true or not, only that people believed they were true. Therefore, millions were once again influenced by this Snackable and shareable quick bait and went into voting booths uninformed or simply not caring. The result, for better or worse, was that Donald Trump was voted to be the next US presiden

The influence of this new type of media is clearly profound. It is only now that Facebook founder Mark Zuckerberg stated that Facebook was 'investigating' ways to combat these news stories. This will hopefully cause some decrease in the number of these click bait news stories. The statement this essay agrees with also has the word 'must' in it. This is also true, as by the end of the Election reputable stories from reputable news agencies like the BBC, CNN, FOX and others were nowhere near as popular. In order to survive these media outlets had to jump on the bandwagon and begin to propagate stories that bordered lies. They had to do so to survive, as society no longer seemed to care about the facts, only instead in reading the most controversial thing that appeared on their newsfeeds. It was only after the fact that outlets such

as the Wall Street Journal begun to call out Facebook for their role in propagating fake news and the immense effect it had on society. In typical style, the company replied with an amusingly vague statement that they were 'investigating' the issue. However, it is too late. The way in which this new form of media negatively impacted these two major events is clear. The way in which society ignored what was true in favour for this fake news negatively impacted people ability to discern fact from fiction and made some media outlets millions. Without any form of regulation, this was inevitable, that some would exploit a captive audience without a thought for the consequences/.

The idea of 'Snackable and Shareable' media is not a new one yet over the past year we have been given two case studies of all that is wrong with it. Those who abused a captive audience and obscured their ability to discern fact from fiction had a profound impact on British and American societies. In order to survive, news agencies had to use social media platforms to propagate stories with dubious or no factual credibility. The consequences of doing so were immense as we have seen and the impact on these two societies huge. Yet there is hope for this changing in the form of regulation forcing news stories posted onto social media platfmms requiring a fact check so that they cannot again cause such damage. However, due to new media's requirement to be snackable and shareable I am sure that media outlets will find a way around this and we will once again be put in this position. This is almost as certain as the 'lies

that were spread this year and the impact that the   these-two soc.ieties.

Question Two: The Question is not whether traditional media catches up - they are unable to cope with or take advantage of the internet.

Assume the - in the question replaces 'the question is whether' or something of the like.

Planning:

Different ways the internet has influenced media. Piracy, Streaming, sink or swim

Ease of Use outweighing moral ideals to not steal.

Rise of P2P sharing and the lack of consequences

Negative effects on Media industries

Napster, 80 Million songs, 25 Million users. CD sales fell from 889M to 806M 2003.

Pirate Bay and the legality around why it is still functioning

Proxy servers and how this further adds to the issue.

Statistics around Pirated content. 42% of adults and 89% of Teens

Streaming services seeming to be the best compromise. Netflix viewership, regaining control, moving forward.

'Essay-:--·-· ....

The Internet is an amazing tool that has allowed for endless new opportunities to be created. With the help of it many have made their millions, we are all better connected and it has become a necessity in our daily lives. Yet this has come at a price, most easily seen as the decline in traditional media. Cinemas and traditional T.V. have been adversely effected in a massive way and whether or not they survive will depend entirely on their ability take advantage of the internet. Those who are able to flourish whilst those who do not will cease to exist.

> **Comment [DB10]:** Coherent introduction that indicates a clear approach to the essay question.

The invention of the internet fundamentally changed a number of factors in the media industry. The most overarching and widespread impact that it facilitated was its ability to connect two people together with relative ease. Of all the technologies that were developed in conjunction with the growing popularity of the internet P2P or peer to peer sharing has been the most influential. Developed as a way of allowing professors to share data with other universities the applications of this technology soon increased in size and variety. It did not take long for people to realize that with the availability of CD drives, people could burn music onto the internet and then share it with millions of others. This was the first major change that the internet caused and showed the first way in which Traditional struggled to keep up.

> **Comment [DB11]:** Addresses the issue of the internet and the effect it made on traditional media. Sets up concept of P2P as the defining and most influential difference between the two.

Pioneered in the 80's this technology came to full fruition in the 90's with the first widely used P2P music sharing site called Napster. This site was by no means the first to attempt to do this but it became popular with its ease of use. In the short space of time of 5 years it quickly had millions of users and tens of millions of songs available to download. This was the first time that something like this had been possible, whereas it had previously required people to seek out and purchase a dodgy CD from an often dodgy dealer. The ease of use that Napster provided was revolutionary. People sitting at home could download and play hundreds of songs across many different Genres for free. This widespread popularity of course soon opened the

floodgates to artists and studios suing Napster. However, the traditional media industries found this extremely difficult as there were no laws around this until the introduction of the Digital Millennia Act in America. This act allowed sharing sites such as Napster to be prosecuted and eventually shut down. However, with no way to deal with websites outside of the jurisdiction of the US government many sites simply moved their servers into different countrie1/

This was devastating for the Music industry. CD sales fell from 889M to 806M and revenues fell by 6.9%. This may not appear like a massive change but the industry felt it. However, with no way to adapt to the growing threat of piracy this traditional media could do nothing. Napster had shown the world the ease in which songs could be shared without having to be paid for and many others rose from its ashes. The Digital Millennial Act outlined huge fines of up to $380,000 for possession of pirated content and up to 20 years in prison for facilitating P2P sharing. Yet this was only if these P2P sharing sites existed within the US. The other issue was tracking those who were downloading pirated content. The US government did not at the time have to capacity to do so and so this trend continued. On top of this, it would seem that even till today no-one gets prosecuted for listening to a pirated song. I have never ever heard of this happening to anyone ever. This utter lack of consequences combined with the ease of use of pirating songs posed a major threat. Traditional studios found themselves unable to combat this and with many governments unable to either pass legislation that would make this illegal or to enforce it meant that traditional music studios were hit hard//

Another side note is the effect of the invention of Proxy servers in the 1990's by international bankers. There servers allowed those who were connected to them to mask their IP address and appear as though they are in a different country. This has a number of practical applications along with making it nearly impossible for anyone to track where these people are further impeding law enforcements attempts to catch content pirates. This provided an extremely easy way for someone to encrypt using 64-bit encryption (very hard to crack) and essentially make them impossible to find. Although why one would care with the lack of consequences that pirating content has, it simply provided another wall that was difficult for traditional media industries to pass.

The next industryt; be hit with these issues was that of the film industry. Once people had realized that they could share songs it was only a matter of time before films were shared as well. All one had to do was obtain a DVD, burn it and upload it to the world. This however required a much larger and robust server system, one that new P2P sharing site Pirate Bay was happy to provide. Pirate Bay has become synonymous with Pirated content not just because of its name but its popularity. It has millions of users and billions of items yet can still exist due to one key trait, it does not host the content itself. This is the loophole in the law that allows many torrenting sites to exist. A P2P sharing website does not host or have any of the illegal content on its servers, nor does the content pass through its servers when the P2P torrent is established. They instead act as a map, providing a way for users to connect to each other with the help of the site without actually touching the content itself. In Sweden, where Pirate Bay is hosted, this is a clear distinction and **not Illegal.** They US government has repeatedly tried to intervene with limited success (they did once manager to take down the site for a few days) yet in doing so this created such controversy in Sweden that they have since been unable to do so. Therefore, Pirate Bay still exists.

Once again, the traditional film industry has almost no way to change or adapt to this. Instead of having a captive audience where a consumer has to either pay to view a film in cinema or buy or rent a DVD, they can now simply wait a few months and download it for free. A study found that 80% of NZ homes have internet access and so this unrivalled convenience is matched only by the lack of consequences of doing so. The Film industry attempted to adapt in a number of ways to this problem the internet had created. The introduction of 256 bit AES encryption on its DVD's failed as if someone records a T.V. playing a DVD it will still be able to be shared. The industry then moved to including technologies like HDR (high dynamic range), uncompressed audio files and increasingly large video formats which were put onto Blu-Ray disks. These were marketed as providing a superior movie experience as well as being in excess of 15GB per hour making downloading them illegally a longer process. This failed too however as few people bought the more expensive movie players (unless they owned a PlayStation 3 or Xbox 360 where these were native) and few people could take advantage of the new technologies as few TV's at the time supp01ied them. This combined with once again the inability for government to police the illegal file sharing meant that the film industry had to rely on the moral basis of those consuming their products rather than any criminal deterre ·

This was the only thing that these two industries could rely on for a time, that the moral code of a great enough proportion of those consuming their products would prevent them from pirating them. In NZ there were large number of ads on TV and rented DVD's like 'would you steal a car, would you steal a handbag' and the like in an attempt to discourage pirates. This is an extremely flimsy assurance to a multi-billion-dollar industry which was beginning to suffer as a result of the Illegal P2P streaming and downloads that were occurring as a result of the internet. These industries no longer had a captive consumer base or a monopoly on distribution and for a time it seemed as though the fate of these industries would be in jeopardy. An interesting Poll from the Herald NZ found that 48% of adults in New Zealand and 89% of Teens had 'consumed content they knew to be pirated in nature'. With over 80% of homes having an internet connection in NZ the internet was fast looking like the demise of traditional media industries who seemed to have no way of stopping the illegal pirating of their content. The few people that are bound to their morals or who believe (that I do) that going to a cinema to watch a new blockbuster is a superior experience than that of headphones as a 5" phone screen were not enough to carry the industry. Therefore, the solution was to join them.------

The industry finally found a way to react to the implications of the internet by stopping their attempts to maintain traditional mediums and instead joined them. They realized that paying $2.19 for a song on iTunes was not a business model that could sustain millions and so legal music streaming services attempted to bridge this gap. Those like Pandora, Apple music and the most popular Spotify emerged as traditional medias answer to the struggles of the internet. Spotify in particular was effective. The service is available for free if you are connected to the internet with the only catch being that you cannot use it without being connected and that you cannot choose your songs, it is permanently on shuffle mode. You are also subject to adve1iising and not being able to change songs yourself. Spotify premium is available for around $10 per month and allows millions of songs to be downloaded, no ads and your own ability to control songs. This solution was a brilliant one as it used to internet to provide a convenient and (relatively) cheap way to get back some control of the market. People were now far more compelled to purchase this service than the $25 per album it would traditionally cost. The fact that here in NZ Spark mobile includes a Spotify premium membership in

of its plans also increased the convenience of the service. Instead of trying to fight against the internet, it instead adapted to it. There will of course always be those who will pirate the music but by making them convenient and relatively cheap, streaming services provide a legal, convenience and morally acceptable way to have millions of songs in one's pocket_/

Following the success of paid music streaming services, the Film industry (and later television industry) took up the same idea. They would provide for the same service with the same convenience and same low(ish) cost. The most noteworthy of these are Amazon Prime and Netflix. These streaming services once again allow the huge number of people with an internet connection with that of a legal way to consume content. Not only this, they are increasingly cheaper than alternatives like paid T.V. Sky T.V. here in NZ costs up to $100 per month for one T.V., a cost many are now refusing to pay. The only monopoly Sky still maintains is of sports coverage. However, most people and families now subscribe to these online services. This once again shows the (eventual) shift in traditional media industries to adapting to the Internet to survive. They will not have full control and are now infringing on other traditional media industries (namely cable or paid TV) but these of course will also adapt. The final issue these streaming services had to contend with was of the use of Proxy servers. Someone subscribed to Netflix in NZ could try and use a Proxy server to change their IP from a 192. (NZ Code) to that of a 202. Mark (US Code) and view US exclusive content. Yet these services quickly built up a database of known false IP addresses and blocked these out, further solidifying their use of the internet.

Moving into 2017 we can certainly see that most of the traditional media industries have adapted to the implications of the internet. With no effective way to fight P2P file sharing, they instead instigated and set up their own legal versions available at low cost and high convenience to millions. We can already see the successes of these services with Netflix' revenue being $3.6 billion before ads and the continued success of music streaming services like Spotify. Therefore, we can see that traditional media has certainly caught up to the internet and utilized it to their own benefit with the introduction of legal streaming services. In the years to come it would appear this will continue with such sites pouring million (Grand Tour costings around $250 million) into their own exclusive content. After a sluggish start it would appear that indeed traditional media has been able to cope with the internet as the statement this essay is based on alludes. The internet has certainly changed the nature of traditional media and for better or worse it would appear that nearly three decades later, they are finally taking advantage of it.