



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

Scholarship, 2005

Media Studies 93303

National Statistics

Assessment Report

Media Studies, Scholarship, 2005 93303

National Statistics

No. Scholarship Results	Results			
	Outstanding Scholarship		Scholarship	
	No. Awards	% of L3 Cohort	No. Awards	% of L3 Cohort
36	2	0.1%	34	1.6%

Commentary

It is pleasing to see the first award of an Outstanding Scholarship in Media Studies. The evidence of both increased candidate entries and increased scholarship awards suggests that teachers and candidates had more confidence in approaching the scholarship examinations in this subject in 2005.

It is to be hoped that as a result of this, teachers will encourage their students to become widely read and literate in this subject, to explore texts and contexts, to develop a sense of emerging trends, and to recognise the ramifications of these. In this manner, candidates for the Scholarship examinations in Media Studies will continue to grow in both number and quality.

General candidate performance

Question 1 produced essays that were often little more than summaries of historical developments in a medium. Many candidates chose to cover the entire history of film and as a result responses lacked structure and were largely descriptive. Better candidates could develop an argument and support it with evidence, but most seemed content to report changes without drawing conclusions or making connections.

The quotation from Malcolm X in Question 3 provided a platform for presenting a considered argument and analysis which, while focusing on a particular subject (censorship, advertising, reality TV etc), generally produced good results. Few, however, attempted to dispute the quotation or offer an alternative reading.

The relationships between technological developments and social, cultural and economic factors were often not considered or were only superficially treated.

Candidates who attempted to use prepared essays or who recycled NCEA Level 3 responses had difficulty developing an argument in response to the quotes and questions.

The best-performing candidates:

- exhibited breadth/depth of knowledge and understanding, and were able to synthesise insightful analysis, which showed originality of thought. Arguments were at times passionate but generally avoided a partisan position
- wrote forcefully and developed a coherent, powerfully argued and well-supported response

- supported arguments with integrated, relevant and specific evidence drawn from a wide range of sources (texts and contexts)
- drew conclusions that were defensible and followed logically from the evidence/argument presented
- understood and communicated the complexity of media studies, particularly showing their awareness that there were no easy answers or solutions.

Other candidates:

- did not answer the question clearly or respond to the quotation effectively
- presented inaccurate evidence in support of argument eg “...*the NZFC established in the 1990s...*” and (on *Nanook of the North*) ‘*The first sign of change in this film that stood it apart from all previous films was the first use of intertitles. These were used to convey information to the audience*’
- presented sweeping assertions with little support eg (candidate has just discussed *Triumph of the Will*) “*Over the next 40 years, the documentary genre was left unchallenged, and so did not ‘evolve’ until Nick Broomfield’s films of the 1980s*”
- drew unsupported or illogical conclusions eg (on the digital revolution) “... *make it both easy and dangerous to make a film. One can create a film in a matter of days with today’s technology. But it is quite dangerous in the view that by individuals making films, we as a gullible society are suspect to believe anything we see or are told*’
- were insufficiently widely read to offer informed comment or appeared not to have viewed, or understood at a basic level, texts that they discussed eg criticising *Triumph of the Will* for not having images of the Holocaust, or stating that *Night and Fog* is purely factual and not creative
- were unable to distinguish between the intent of Questions 1 and 2 and, therefore, tended to simply repeat material or attempt to rephrase the same answer.